

1

A DISCOURSE

ON THE SUBJECT OF

AMERICAN SLAVERY,

DELIVERED IN THE

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL MEETING HOUSE,

IN MENDON, MASS.

July 4, 1837.

BY ADIN BALLOU.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST OF THE HEARERS.

BOSTON:
PRINTED BY ISAAC KNAPP,
25, CORNHILL.

1837.

DISCOURSE.

‘ Brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report—if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things.—PHIL. iv. 8.

Christian friends and fellow citizens :

I am happy to believe that there *is some* virtue, and *some* praise of moral excellence among you. Let me then commend to you, with earnest affection, the exhortation of the apostle. Let me do so under the cheering expectation, that you will heartily acknowledge whatsoever things are *true*, approve whatsoever things are *honest*, promote whatsoever things are *just*, embrace whatsoever things are *pure*, recommend whatsoever things are *lovely*, and practise whatsoever things are deservedly of *good report*.

I rise to address you on a subject of momentous importance ; a subject rooted in the vitals of religion, morality and civil liberty—the discussion of which seems to rock the very foundations of society, producing the triple effect of

disgust in the *indifferent*, alarm in the *timid good*, and rage in the myrmidons of despotism. But I rise not to address your passions. It is with your understandings, your reason, and your consciences, that I have to do. Avoiding the more exciting strains of my theme, I shall submit dispassionately to your consideration facts and arguments, in relation to American Slavery—its character and tendency, its utter repugnancy to Christianity and republicanism, the duty of endeavoring its immediate annihilation, and the only effectual method of consummating such a result.

If in this attempt I shall swerve from the line of *truth*, honesty, justice, purity and rectitude, follow not my footsteps, but adhere with undeviating constancy to the Apostolic direction in the text. Let it be your supreme anxiety to know the truth and discharge your duty—as unto God and not to man.

You have long been accustomed to regard this great national anniversary as sacred to liberty. Think not that I would desecrate it. It is for *liberty*—pure, rational, universal liberty, that I lift up my voice. This liberty has its fountain head in God. It was breathed into man with that breath of the Almighty which made our common progenitor a '*living soul*.' It is the birthright of all his children, and nothing but sin has hitherto defrauded them of its advantages and blessings. Had man loved his Creator with all the heart, and his neighbor as himself, slavery had never cursed the earth. The source of genuine liberty remains the same. The condition of its existence remains the same. Obedience to the law of the Eternal—to the law which requires

perfect filial, and fraternal love in every soul, is the only condition of its existence and prosperity. Neither individuals nor nations can be free without virtue. All approximations to true liberty by persons or communities, will necessarily be in proportion to the amount of their moral principle and virtue. Liberty may, indeed, be proclaimed, professed, and panegyricized where the Divine law is trodden under foot, but it exists only in *name*. The air may resound with its praise, and parchments dazzle with its inscriptions, but it is only a gilded idol—a senseless, powerless image, whose worshippers may praise, but can never profit by their heartless god. Where the name of Jehovah is blasphemed, and his commandments are violated, and man is imbruted by his brother man—*there* sin and slavery, and misery, and death reign.

This nation sprung into existence, with the cry of liberty in its first breath. The illustrious men who represented these *then* Colonies, in 1776, solemnly declared to all the world, that they held *these* truths ‘*self-evident*,’ viz.—‘All men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.’ They did not profess to have invented, nor even to have discovered, these truths. Nor did they hold them to be equivocal or debatable, but *self-evident* truths. As such, long before revealed in the solemn doctrines of Christianity, they avouched them as the foundation on which to assert the national independence of these United States. To maintain their doctrines of liberty and independence, as based on these great pillars of

self-evident truth and righteousness, they pledged to each other their 'lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.'

Liberty, then, is not a creature of man ; it is not a form of words on parchment ; it is not the uncertain sound of a trumpet ; it is not the echo of a mob ; it is not a gaudy idol, carved and gilded by human craftsmen, to be glorified and shouted at by a vicious multitude ; but it is an original gift of God, a vital principle, a spring of the rational soul—whose native elasticity and vigor, sin, wrong and outrage, alone impair.

The history of mankind abundantly shows, that *liberty* has expired in nations nominally free, long before their charters and constitutions became metamorphosed into the instruments of tyranny. So that not unfrequently, poets and orators have *moved* the multitude to sing and dance over the very grave of that *liberty*, which was the idol of their deification.

Instead of calling you to an exhibition of such folly, let it be my office on the present occasion to conduct you to the root of our national liberty—and while *there*, instead of amusing you with the gaudy foliage and blossoms overhead, to show you the ravages of a *death-worm*, that is gnawing its way to the heart. And however painful this office may be to you, or to myself, let me not be deemed less a friend, either to my country or its liberties, than those more pleasing declaimers, who choose to float in airy circles around the zone of leaves and blossoms, forgetful of the danger below. The *death-worm* now rioting near the heart of our liberties is **SLAVERY**.

Slavery is the baleful offspring of sin. It

originated in contempt of God, and hatred of brother man. It lives and flourishes in selfishness, injustice and cruelty ; and nothing will annihilate it but the power of that holiness which grows out of love supreme to our Creator and love unalloyed to our neighbor. This is its immortal antagonist, acting on the reason and the conscience, and extending itself from mind to mind, with a gradual but omnipotent force.

WHAT SLAVERY IS.

What then is slavery—American slavery? ‘A slave [says the Louisiana code] is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, his labor ; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing but which must belong to his master.’ The laws of South Carolina thus define slavery—‘Slaves shall be deemed, taken, reputed, and adjudged to be chattels personal in the hands of their masters and possessors, to all intents and purposes whatsoever.’ ‘All their issue and offspring, born or to be born, shall be, and they are hereby declared to be and remain *forever hereafter*, absolute slaves, and shall follow the condition of their mother.’

INCAPACITY OF SLAVES.

All such slaves are declared by law, and judicial decisions, to be incapable 1, of making any contract ; 2, of bringing any suit at law ; 3, of giving evidence against any white person ; 4, of entering into the estate of marriage ; 5, of receiving, acquiring or holding property.

In all these important respects the system of slavery reduces its victims to a level with the

cattle of the field. They are mere animal property, at the absolute disposal of their owners. They can earn millions of property, but not possess a cent—all belongs to their masters. They may receive presents, and legacies, but not for their own benefit. They may contract *nominally* with their masters, for their liberty at the price of a thousand dollars, and pay it, yet legally be sold the next day by those same masters for another thousand dollars, into hopeless bondage—without the possibility of redress. They may be beaten, maimed, and all but murdered, by their overseer; but can make no legal complaint to any magistrate, either on their own behalf, or that of the State. They may see a thousand murders perpetrated by white persons, but cannot be allowed to bear witness to the fact in any court of law. Yet, if the interest of their owners so requires, they can at any time give evidence against a brother slave, or free black. Likewise, they may be arrested, tried and executed for a multitude of offences, which in white persons either escape recognition, or are punished only with fines and imprisonment. They may be paired off in mock marriage, to suit their masters, or left to herd together like cattle, for the rearing of young slaves, but in *law* can have neither *husband*, *wife* nor *child*. These natural relations are all effectually nullified by statute. Consequently, those demands of God touching the duties of husband and wife, parents and children, are all obliterated by the ploughshare of slavery. The slave has no wife, that he can call his own, to love and protect—no children, that he can call his own, to nurture and admonish. The command against adultery touch-

es not the case of any such husbands and wives, as are recognized by slavery. Neither are the children of slaves in any condition to 'honor' their parents. The word of God is made of none effect, by a relict of pagan barbarism, which has *out-paganized* paganism itself. For it is a deplorable fact, that the artificial wants and luxuries of advanced civilization in the masters, (if so we may speak,) have only sunk the slave to lower depths of wretchedness. The distance between him and his master in these United States, is legally greater than between master and slave in any other age or country of the world.

MEANS OF KEEPING DOWN THE SLAVE.

It naturally follows that to keep human beings in a state of subjection to such a system of slavery as this, great and extraordinary precautions must be taken. Such a slavery cannot co-exist with education, information and personal indulgence. Ignorance must be made to brood like midnight darkness over the enthralled; and all the *realities* as well as *idealities* of absolute terror be brought to bear upon them.

Accordingly we find it enacted in South Carolina, that every slave found in any assembly, convened in a confined or secret place for 'mental instruction,' though in the presence of a white, shall suffer the infliction of 20 lashes. Also, that any person teaching a slave to write shall be fined £100. In North Carolina, to teach a slave to read or write, or to sell or give him any book, or pamphlet, exposes the offender to 39 lashes, or imprisonment, if he be a free negro—or a fine of \$200 if he be a white person. In Virginia, any and every school, or

meeting of slaves by night or day, convened for instruction in reading or writing, is an unlawful assembly, exposing each slave present to 20 lashes by order of a Justice. In Georgia, a white person, for teaching a free negro or a slave to read or write, is liable to a fine of \$500, besides imprisonment at the discretion of Court. In Louisiana the penalty for this offence is one year's imprisonment.

Such are some of the precautions employed to prevent the slaves from becoming dangerous through the knowledge of letters. They are prevented obeying their Saviour's injunction, to 'search the Scriptures,' lest they should become troublesome to their owners.

Neither are they greatly better off in respect to *oral*, moral and religious instruction; for though the laws do not absolutely cut them off from all such instruction, they evidently render it of little avail. The amount of labor required through the week, not only wearies their bodies and paralyzes their minds, but is followed by so many cares and vexations on the Sabbath, that if their opportunities were otherwise ever so great to hear preaching, they could get little good from attendance on public worship. This, however, is not the worst of their case; for extreme and jealous restrictions are laid upon them by law.

In Georgia, any justice may break up any religious assembly of slaves, at his own discretion, and order each slave present whipped 'on the bare back, 25 lashes, with a whip, switch or cow-skin.' In South Carolina, slaves must hold no religious meetings before sunrise, or after sunset, unless in presence of a greater number of whites, under penalty of '20 lashes,

well laid on.' In Virginia all evening meetings of slaves are unequivocally prohibited. Under what other circumstances slaves might attend the public worship of God to advantage, considering their toil, cares, and general inaptitude for the preaching heard in the churches where their masters assemble, we can very well imagine. The great majority of them must be in a state of deplorable heathenism. All this from slaveholding *necessity*, lest they should insensibly imbibe some rays of light, and cease to be manageable brutes. One would think from the strength of the walls thrown up around them, to keep them in ignorance, that their masters must have a much higher opinion of their natural capacity for learning, than is usually ascribed to them. They are often represented as a grade of beings, more akin to monkeys than to white men ; but if so, their masters have certainly taken unnecessary pains to prevent their rivalling the whites. The noblest nation of whites on earth, placed under such restrictions, during three or four generations, would probably need no extra vigilance to keep them down.

Again : severe restraints are imposed upon the slaves, in respect to their personal liberty. In Georgia, if a slave be found out of the limits of his town, or even off his master's plantation, without license, any white person may give him 20 lashes on the bare back. The same in Virginia, Kentucky and Mississippi, at the discretion of a Justice.

In South Carolina and Georgia, any person, finding more than seven slaves together in the highway, without some white person in company, may give each one 20 lashes. In Virginia,

Kentucky, and Missouri, a slave for keeping a gun, powder, shot, club, or other weapon whatsoever, offensive or defensive, may be whipped 39 lashes, by order of a Justice.

In North Carolina and Tennessee, a slave travelling without a pass, or found in another person's negro quarters or kitchen, may be whipped 40 lashes; and every slave, in whose company the visitor is found, 20 lashes. In Louisiana, for being on horseback without a written permit, the slave incurs 25 lashes. For keeping a dog, also, 25 lashes. In Maryland; for rambling, riding, or going abroad in the night, or riding horses in the day time without leave, a slave may be whipped, cropped, or branded on the cheek with the letter R. &c. In South Carolina, the law provides, that any white person, finding a slave away from his plantation and his master, may pursue, apprehend, and moderately correct such slave; and if the slave strike such white person, he may be *lawfully killed* on the spot. In Georgia, a slave striking a white person, even in self defence, for the second offence, suffers death. In South Carolina, ordinarily, death is suffered for the third offence. In Maryland, cropping for *each* offence. In Kentucky, for lifting the hand against a white, the slave incurs '30 lashes on the bare back, well laid on, by order of a Justice.'

Once more: in order effectually to discourage all habits of providence in the slaves, and to prevent them by any possibility, acquiring even the most meagre estate of any kind, the southern laws provide as follows:—In South Carolina that no slave shall be allowed to keep a boat, or to raise and breed for his own bene-

fit, any horses, cattle, sheep or hogs, under pain of forfeiture; and any person may seize all such articles, belonging by pretence to a slave, wherever he finds them. In Georgia, a master is liable to a fine of \$30, for suffering his slave to hire himself out at wages on his own account. In Maryland, the master, who permits his slave to earn and receive wages for himself, forfeits \$13 per month. In Virginia, also, the master is fineable for allowing a slave to work for himself at wages. In North Carolina, 'all horses, cattle, hogs, or sheep, that shall belong to any slave, or be of any slave's mark, in this State, shall be seized and sold by the County Wardens.' In Mississippi, the master incurs a penalty of \$50, if he allows a slave to raise cotton for himself, or to keep stock of any description. Thus even the benevolence of the masters is barred up with adamant, lest the poor slave should any how contrive to be comfortable in his servitude—and lest, by having something of his own, he should be under less temptation to become a thief and a liar.

My friends, can you see any thing left by law to the slave, worth coveting? Do you see any room for further legal degradation? I confess I cannot. You will ask if the laws afford no protection to slaves against the lusts and violence of their owners. I will give you a specimen of such as they do afford. In South Carolina, a white who kills a slave 'on a sudden heat of passion, or by undue correction,' pays a fine and suffers imprisonment six months. A certain law of the same State also provides that—'in case any person shall wilfully cut out the tongue, put out the eye, cruelly scald, burn,' maim, &c. any slave, he shall pay a fine of

£100 current money!! This, however, not to accrue to the benefit of the slave. Considering how very trifling an affair it would be to have one's tongue cut out, or to have half the skin scalded from one's body, or to have a foot burnt off up to the ankle, or to have an eye bored out with a red hot iron, this penalty must be considered truly appalling! In some of the sugar-making, cotton-growing States of the South West, where the slaves are as much worse off than their brethren in Kentucky, as these last are than our lowest free colored people, there are laws forbidding masters to work their slaves over 15 hours in summer and 14 in winter, out of every 24—which, if necessary laws, must certainly be better than none. How much longer than 15 hours a day, some avaricious masters and their mercenary drivers, would force their slaves to work, we are left to conjecture. And whether any one would be likely to prosecute in *such* a country, if he should know the law to have been violated, is also a subject of conjecture. The greatest security which the slave can enjoy in such a land, must be found in the *interest* of his owner; who, if nothing transport him beyond ordinary bounds, will be likely to keep his slave in decent working order, and to preserve life and limb, that he may at least find a good market for him.

There are indeed numerous laws which provide for the indemnification of masters, on account of damages done by the killing, maiming and disabling of their slaves. But of course these laws, even when executed, are only a safe guard, to the master's purse, not to the slave's person. To illustrate this point we have

only to take one judicial decision, where a slaveholder sued a man for damages who had brutally tortured and maimed one of his slaves. The judge graciously ordered the offender to pay so many hundred dollars for the slave, and take the cripple off the other's hands. So that all the redress obtained by the slave, was to be put for life completely in the power of the *fiend* who had mutilated him.

It will be asked if the masters who murder their slaves, or perpetrate great outrages on their persons, are not exposed to punishment under prosecutions at *common law*. I reply that southern statutes have completely nullified the common law. Suppose a master should commit all the crimes, on the persons of his slaves, which are in any way punishable at common law? Who is to bring the action? It must be a white person. Who may give testimony to the facts? White persons only. And who are to try the case? White persons only. All power is with the masters. Masters must prosecute, masters testify to the facts, and masters give judgment. It has been affirmed on good authority, that there is not an instance on record, of a slaveholder having been executed for the murder of a slave.

LIABILITIES OF SLAVES.

But on the other hand, as if to reverse all the dictates and axioms of divine justice, these same slaves are governed by a most partial and rigorous criminal code. Notwithstanding their natural ignorance; notwithstanding all the barriers which have been reared to exclude them from the merest rudiments of lettered knowledge, it is affirmed that no slave

are punishable with death, in a Virginia slave, which offences entail only minor punishments, when committed by whites. In the other southern States also, a multitude of crimes expose the slave to capital punishment, which are either not recognized in a white at all, or only punished by fine and imprisonment. Except in Louisiana, imprisonment as a punishment for slaves is scarcely known. The summary process of whipping or hanging is deemed far more convenient. How such a partial and sanguinary code, administered wholly by slaveholders, with all their habits of despotic command, and with all their latitude of legal tyranny, is brought to bear upon the slave, we need not entertain much doubt. Such laws and penalties, in such hands, on such subjects, must, in the very nature of things, leave justice and mercy to *accident*—rendering them mere casual exceptions to the general rule; i. e. unless human nature at the South is unlike its kind in every other part of the world. That they are not exceptions to their species, facts too painful to detail, might, if necessary, be adduced to prove. But I will not trouble you with them. The bare outline of slavery—the dry theory of the system, is sufficiently odious and horrible without prying into all the secrets of the prison-house.

What then shall we say to these things? What shall we *think*, when we reflect that 2,500,000 persons, or about one sixth part of the whole population of this Union, are hemmed in and crushed down by such a system of studied, legal despotism as this? What can we say, when we reflect that the murky cloud lowers over one half the States of this great and

professedly Christian republic, polluting the common *metropolis* of the nation, and extending itself into vast territories at the South and West? What ought to be our emotions, when we further consider, that our country has nominally a free colored population, of several hundred thousands, themselves generally so degraded by the influences of slavery, as to be little better, if not worse off than the slaves? It is even so. The slaves have increased within less than fifty years, from 700,000 to their present number. Their annual increase is now said to be, at least 60,000. During forty years their numbers were trebled. Forty years hence, should nothing interpose to hinder, they will probably amount to ten or twelve millions. What is to become of them, or of their masters, is a question which may be more easily asked than answered. And what is to become of us, who from our peculiar civil and social relations, are so intimately connected with our slaveholding brethren, is no frivolous inquiry. But above all, how our national and individual liberties can be preserved, against the inroads and underminings of the *spirit of slavery*, is the greatest problem to be solved.

Point me, my friends, to any emperor, king, prince, or chieftain, in a Christian, a Mahometan, or a Pagan land, whose subjects are governed by laws and usages so absolutely despotic as those of our own republican slave system! Tell me which of all our State Prisons, is not on the whole, governed by a police less barbarous—more gentle and humane! Tell me, if any of you have so dear a friend on earth, that you would willingly give yourselves and your children up, as absolutely to that friend's dispo-

sal, as these poor slaves are subjected by statute to the control of their owners. Who, in a distant land, after having read the history of our Revolution, and enlisted his generous sympathies on our side, could believe that such laws and such an institution of domestic tyranny existed in our midst? Or if so overwhelmed by the force of evidence, as to believe us sunk to these depths of disgrace, what stranger would imagine that our land teemed with statesmen, divines, orators and poets—all vocal with the panegyrics of liberty? Yet so it is.

But perhaps you will say—the evil of slavery, though so frightful in theory, may be quite tolerable in practice. How can you suppose so? Knowing human nature as you do, its universal propensity to abuse power, how should you even *hope* that slavery would be tolerable in practice? Do not think that I would have you regard your southern brethren, as less humane, generous, and kind by nature than yourselves? Rather would I have you think better of them than worse—think them more gentle, amiable and benignant than the sons and daughters of the North. But what then? would that place them above those dreadful influences of education, habit, and circumstances, which act upon all minds within a slaveholding atmosphere? Undoubtedly there are many gentle-natured, kind hearted masters and mistresses, who in spite of ten thousand malign influences, exhibit noble examples of a humane regard to their slaves. But alas, how painful is it to think, that even *these* are giving their sanction indirectly, to all the cruelties which are inseparable from the general system! Alas, too, how few of their better feelings and wishes, will

the harsh laws and despotic usages, under which they live, permit to do any thing for their slaves, except to make them comfortable as animals ! Suppose our charity were to stretch itself beyond all reasonable calculations, and we were to conclude that only *one* slave in a *thousand* was abused :—even *then*, we should have 2,500 miserable creatures, sending up groans to heaven against their tormentors. How is this ? What if we could gather those wretches and their persecutors, all into one field before us, and behold their anguish, and hear their cries for mercy, and look upon their bleeding backs, and be obliged to witness their complicated miseries for a single hour ! how should we feel and act ? And are we such philanthropists, that we can have no feeling for our suffering fellow creatures, unless they are immediately before our eyes ?

These 2,500 miserable creatures are just as wretched, scattered over the face of our southern country, as if gathered on a single field in our full view. Nor must we flatter ourselves that only such a comparative handful as this, are with cries of distress importuning the ear of the Almighty. I fear that instead of one out of a thousand, nine hundred out of a thousand experience every year such treatment as would drive *our* most forbearing hired servants from our employment, with execrations.

But perhaps it is not so ; God grant that we may not judge amiss. Laying aside then, for one moment, every idea awakened in the mind by oral and written statements, let me ask—if, considering the slaves as mere animals, it would be possible for any of us to suppose them all well treated ? We know how our working

animals are sometimes abused. Could we naturally presume that all the slaves were well housed, well clothed, well fed, well driven, properly worked, and humanely treated? If we could expect all this, we should credit a greater miracle than history records, since the foundation of the world. Yet granting all this, would you even then be in favor of slavery? Would you be willing your posterity should be converted into such *well treated animals*? Surely not; you revolt at the proposition. The conversion of intelligent beings into mere working animals, however kindly treated they might be *as* animals, would be accounted by us all an intolerable degradation.

I am aware that slaveholders often boldly affirm their innocence in this matter. I know that both they and their apologists, pretend that the enslaved are well used, contented and happy—and even better off than our northern free laborers. But I see abundant evidence to the contrary wherever I look; and if I had no other, I should rest upon the testimony of those slaveholders, and friends of slaveholders who have honestly exposed the abuses and abominations of the system. And now, instead of further guesses and suppositions, let us come to this very testimony.

What says THOMAS JEFFERSON?

‘The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions; the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it; for man is an imitative animal. This quality is the germ of all education in him. From his cradle to his grave he is learning to do what he sees others do. If a parent could find no motive either in his philanthropy or his self-love, for restraining the intemperance of passion towards his slave, it should always be a sufficient one that his child

is present. But generally it is not sufficient. The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives loose to his worst passions, and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances.'

Shall we credit this great man, who was born and lived in the midst of slavery? Hear him again :—

'Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep for ever; that considering numbers, nature and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation is among possible events: that it may become probable by supernatural interference! The Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest.'

Hear him once more :

'What an incomprehensible machine is man! Who can endure toil, famine, stripes, imprisonment, and death itself, in vindication of his own liberty, and the next moment be deaf to all those motives whose power supported him through his trial, and inflict on his fellow men a bondage, one hour of which is fraught with more misery than ages of that which he rose in rebellion to oppose. But we must wait with patience the workings of an overruling Providence, and hope that that is preparing the deliverance of these our suffering brethren. When the measure of their tears shall be full—when their tears shall have involved heaven itself in darkness—doubtless a God of justice will awaken to their distress, and by diffusing a light and liberality among their oppressors, or, at length by his exterminating thunder, manifest his attention to things of this world, and that they are not left to the guidance of blind fatality.'

Jeffersonian republicans, what think ye of this? Are not such sentiments worthy of the author of our Declaration of Independence? Was he a fanatic? a mad man? an incendiary? Well might such a man say—'I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.'

What said PATRICK HENRY ?

‘Is it not amazing, that at a time, when the rights of humanity are defined and understood with precision, in a country, above all others, fond of liberty, that in such an age, and in such a country, we find men professing a religion the most humane, mild, gentle and generous, adopting a principle as repugnant to humanity, as it is inconsistent with the Bible, and destructive to liberty ? Every thinking, honest man rejects it in speculation. How few in practice, from conscientious motives !

Would any one believe that I am master of slaves, of my own purchase ! I am drawn along by the general inconvenience of living here without them. I will not, I cannot justify it. However culpable my conduct, I will so far pay my devoir to virtue, as to own the excellence and rectitude of her precepts, and lament my want of conformity to them.’

That was honestly uttered. Patrick Henry had a conscience. He disdained to justify himself in a fashionable wrong. Oh that our Calhouns, our Prestons, and McDuffies, would deign to imitate him. They would cease to glorify this imbruting vice as an ordinance of God and the ‘corner stone of republican liberty.’

Hear WILLIAM PINCKNEY, in his celebrated speech in the Maryland house of delegates, 1789. After discharging the thunder of his eloquence against the abominable slave trade, he turned upon slavery itself, and thus he spoke :

‘But wherefore should we confine the edge of censure to our ancestors, or those from whom they purchased ? Are not we *EQUALLY guilty* ? *They* strewed around the seeds of slavery—we cherish and sustain the growth. *They* introduced the system—we enlarge, invigorate and confirm it. Yes, let it be handed down to posterity, that the people of Maryland, who could fly to arms with the promptitude of Roman citizens, when the hand of oppression was lifted up against themselves ; who could behold their country desolated and their citizens slaughtered ; who could brave, with unshaken firmness, every calamity of war before they would submit to the smallest infringement of their rights—that this very people could yet see thousands of their fellow creatures, within the limits of their territory, bending beneath an unnatural yoke ; and, instead of being assiduous to destroy their shackles, anxious to immortalize their duration, so

that a nation of slaves might forever exist in a country where freedom is its boast.

Sir, it is really a matter of astonishment to me, that the people of Maryland do not blush at the very name of freedom. I admire that modesty does not keep them silent in her cause. That they who have, by the deliberate acts of their legislature, treated her most obvious dictates with contempt; who have exhibited for a long series of years, a spectacle of slavery which they still are solicitous to perpetuate; who, not content with exposing to the world for near a century, a speaking picture of abominable oppression, are still ingenious to prevent the hand of generosity from robbing it of half its horrors; that they should step forward as the zealous partisans of freedom, cannot but astonish a person who is not casuist enough to reconcile antipathies.

For shame, sir! let us throw off the mask; 'tis a cobweb one at best, and the world will see through it. It will not do thus to talk like philosophers, and act like *unrelenting tyrants*; to be perpetually sermonizing it, with liberty for our text, and actual oppression for our commentary.

But, sir, is it possible that this body should not feel for the reputation of Maryland? Is national honor unworthy of consideration? Is the censure of an enlightened universe insufficient to alarm us? It may proceed from the ardor of youth, perhaps, but the character of my country among the nations of the world is as dear to me as that country itself. What a motley appearance must Maryland at this moment make in the eyes of those who view her with deliberation! Is she not at once the fair temple of freedom, and the abominable nursery of slaves; the school for patriots, and the foster-mother of *petty despots*; the asserter of human rights, and the patron of wanton oppression? Here have emigrants from a land of tyranny found an asylum from persecution, and here also have those, who came as rightfully free as the winds of heaven, found an eternal grave for the liberties of themselves and their posterity!

Was William Pinckney a stranger to slavery? Was he a fanatic? an incendiary? a madman? Yet how like some that are so denominated he speaks.

Hear WILLIAM EATON:

[The Tunisians had captured nine hundred and twenty Sardinian slaves, of whom General Eaton thus makes mention:]

'Many have died of grief, and the others linger out a life less tolerable than death. Alas—remorse seizes my whole

soul when I reflect, that this is indeed but a copy of the very barbarity which my eyes have seen in my own native country. And yet we boast of liberty and national justice. How frequently in the southern States of my own country, have I seen weeping mothers leading the guiltless infant to the sales with as deep anguish as if they led them to the slaughter; and yet felt my bosom tranquil in the view of these aggressions on defenceless humanity. But when I see the same enormities practised upon beings whose complexions and blood claim kindred with my own, I curse the perpetrators, and weep over the wretched victims of their rapacity. Indeed, truth and justice demand from me the confession, that the Christian slaves among the barbarians of Africa, are treated with more humanity than the African slaves among professing Christians of civilized America; and yet here sensibility bleeds at every pore for the wretches whom fate has doomed to slavery.'

Was Gen. Eaton competent to judge of the comparative merits of slavery on the two continents? And is his testimony to be credited? Let him that hath an ear to hear, consider.

Hear Mr. B. SWAIN of N. Carolina, 1830 :

'Is it nothing to us, that seventeen hundred thousand of the people of our country, are doomed illegally to the most abject and vile slavery that was ever tolerated on the face of the earth? Are Carolinians deaf to the piercing cries of humanity? Are they insensible to the demands of justice? Let any man of spirit and feeling, for a moment cast his thoughts over the land of slavery—think of the nakedness of some, the hungry yearnings of others, the flowing tears and heaving sighs of parting relations, the wailings of lamentation and woe, the bloody cut of the keen lash, and the frightful scream that rends the very skies,—and all this to gratify ambition, lust, pride, avarice, vanity, and other depraved feelings of the human heart. Too long has our country been unfortunately lulled to sleep, feeding on the golden dreams of superficial politicians, fanciful poets, and anniversary orations. *The worst is not generally known.* Were all the miseries, the horrors of slavery, to burst at once into view, a peal of seven-fold thunder could scarce strike greater alarm. We cannot yet believe the condition of our country so desperate, as to forbid the judicious application of proper remedies.'

Hear Mr. SUMMERS of Virginia :

'Sir, the evils of this system cannot be enumerated. It were unnecessary to attempt it. They glare upon us at eve-

ry step. When the owner looks to his wasted estate, he knows and feels them. When the statesman examines the condition of his country, and finds her moral influence gone, her physical strength diminished, her political power waning, he sees and must confess them. Will gentlemen inform us when this subject will become *less* delicate, when it will be attended with *fewer* difficulties than at present—and at what period we shall be *better* enabled to meet them? Shall we be more adequate to the end proposed, after the resources of the state have been yet longer paralyzed by the withering, desolating influence of our present system? Sir, every year's delay but augments the difficulties of this great business, and weakens our ability to compass it. Like silly children, we endeavor to postpone the work, which we know must be performed.'

Hear the famous Rev. R. J. BRECKINRIDGE, a Kentucky Colonizationist and late opponent of GEORGE THOMPSON:

'What, then, is slavery? for the question relates to the action of certain principles on it, and to its probable and proper results; what is slavery as it exists among us? We reply, it is that condition enforced by the laws of one-half the states of this confederacy, in which one portion of the community, called masters, is allowed such power over another portion called slaves; as,

1. To deprive them of the entire earnings of their own labor, except only so much as is necessary to continue labor itself, by continuing healthful existence, thus committing clear robbery;

2. To reduce them to the necessity of universal concubinage, by denying to them the civil rights of marriage; thus breaking up the dearest relations of life, and encouraging universal prostitution;

3. To deprive them of the means and opportunities of moral and intellectual culture, in many States making it a high penal offence to teach them to read; thus perpetuating whatever of evil there is that proceeds from ignorance;

4. To set up between parents and their children an authority higher than the impulse of nature and the laws of God; which breaks up the authority of the father over his own offspring, and at pleasure separates the mother at a returnless distance from her child; thus abrogating the clearest laws of nature: thus outraging all decency and justice, and degrading and oppressing thousands upon thousands of beings created like themselves in the image of the Most High God! This is slavery as it is daily exhibited in every slave State.'

I might continue these quotations to a great length, but I fear I am already tiring your patience. Permit me to ask—Can any thing worse be said of practical slavery, than has been said by slaveholders and their friends? I will not pause to sum up the odious epithets in which they have denounced it. You will bear in mind, that I have adduced not the despised railings of, so called, fanatics, but of men whom no class in community will discredit. According to their testimony, is not *practical* slavery quite as intolerable as *theoretical*? Is there one redeeming quality in the whole system. Look at its effect on the brutified slave. See how it depraves and corrupts the master and his family. Witness the innumerable temptations with which it fosters every crime forbidden in the decalogue. See the foreign and domestic slave trade preserved and promoted by it. Consider the tyranny, the robbery, the prostitution, the adultery, the amalgamation, the begetting and selling of slaves by masters, the murder, the theft, falsehood, cruelty and outrage, which are inseparable from the system, and to which it is perpetually giving birth.

And what is the genius of slavery? How does its presiding spirit affect the non-slaveholding community? Is there no danger from its encroachments? Do we flatter ourselves that this spirit of oppression is harmless to us? Do we imagine that it will never make war upon our rights and possessions? Let us not be deceived; as it expands and strengthens itself, it will frown and lower upon New England. It is a Spirit that cannot brook restraint—that maddens at reproof—that cannot endure even the mildest opposition. It is the radical antag-

onist of liberty. It will be at peace with the free no longer than they consent to its devouring the prey. Its appetite enlarges with indulgence. Every year it craves more blood and sinews. It covets new domains and grasps at more distant spoils. It cries 'give, give,' and never saith 'it is enough.' It trembles with cowardly apprehensions of domestic danger, but neither repents of its wrongs nor proposes the most distant reformation. It relies on cruelty and terror, not clemency and justice, for defence. It is stung by the exposure of its wickedness, yet only blusters and defies. It forbids the discussion of its own merits, and threatens vengeance, with or without law, against all who dare to plead the cause of its speechless victims. It has wrought with all deceiveableness of unrighteousness, upon the vulgar passions, sordid interests, and vile prejudices, of all susceptible descriptions of men throughout the land. It has conjured up, in mobocratic combination, every unclean and reptile spirit. It has even wrought upon many of the otherwise well disposed and good—filling them with false alarms of danger to religion and danger to their country. It has raised a cry from one extremity of the nation to another—'The Union is in danger,'—'The church will be split,'—'Let slavery alone,'—'There is no remedy,'—'Down with the fanatics.' It has presided at Lynchings, and caused innocent citizens to be scourged, mangled, imprisoned, and in nameless ways harassed, on account of the exercise of that freedom of speech and the press, which has been solemnly guaranteed in the Constitution of the Republic. It has set a price on the heads of its leading op-

ponents, and offered thousands of gold, as a temptation for the abduction of the most worthy and philanthropic of men—thus instigating ruffians to the most flagrant outrages, and endangering the peace of the country. It has even gone into the halls of Legislation, and there proposed to expunge from our National Constitution, the essential elements of liberty—and to bind the free States to pass laws abridging those very rights, which have been universally acknowledged inherent and unalienable.

These are painful and lamentable facts, which we can neither overlook, nor forget; and they bring home the question of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. They compel us to return from our contemplations of the horrors of African slavery, to the protection of our own offspring. They dictate the re-assertion of our jeopardized rights—lest that Hydra which now riots on the blood and flesh and sinews of the Ethiopian, should by and by turn upon the sons and daughters of the Pilgrims. Whether we contemplate *slavery* in one aspect or another, it appears intolerably abhorrent. Every good and intelligent man, it seems to me, must feel called on by the portentous aspect which the evil has assumed, to cast about for a remedy. It will not do to evade, and equivocate, and postpone forever; something must be done.

Will any good man say, ‘*There is no remedy?*’ There *must* be a remedy. It cannot be possible, that a holy God, has provided no remedy for such an evil. It is an imputation on the Great Benignant, Moral Governor, to say, ‘There is no remedy for slavery.’ Let it be humbly, prayerfully, and perseveringly sought, and it will be found. Surely, God will be in-

quired of for such a remedy. But *have* we inquired of Him for it? Are the people of this land now sincerely inquiring, at His holy Oracle for light on this subject? Do they generally care enough about it, to set themselves seriously down to the great inquiry? Do all our professed Christians and their Pastors, feel and act as if they were in earnest to put away this great Plague? as if it were their prayer to God, night and day, to find a remedy? Alas! this is not the state of things throughout this nominally Christian country. When the hearts of the people are turned to the question, and professed Christians are where they ought to be, God will reveal the remedy. When there shall be a *will*, there will be a *way* to terminate slavery.

PROPOSED REMEDY.

I need not inform you that a *remedy* has been proposed, and is now before the people of this Union for consideration. I need not inform you, that though the great majority of the nation, have as yet disdained seriously to discuss the merits of the remedial proposition, it has been warmly embraced by thousands of Christians, philanthropists and patriots. That proposed remedy, which is, *immediate emancipation of all the enthralled slaves*, has commended itself to my understanding and conscience as the only *just, safe, practicable, effectual* one for this horrible malady. If, however, a better can be proposed, I shall be happy to adopt it. But all the lights of divine revelation, reason, history and experience, concur in my mind, to establish the conclusion, that this is the *remedy sought*. It was the privilege of thousands of enlightened and generous spirits to embrace

this proposition, before the light of its excellency illuminated my darker mind. It is no doubt equally true, that other thousands of illustrious men, at whose feet it might become such an one as myself to sit for instruction, remain to be convinced of what appears to me unquestionable truth. But I am persuaded that all the truly wise and good will ultimately come to the one conclusion. Under this impression, I cannot understand why there should be so much reluctance, in some of the high places of religion and learning, to come manfully to the investigation of this question. It must be met. Something must be done. And the least that any man, however doubtful he may be, can with propriety do, is to promote discussion and research. Without these the progress of human improvement never has been and never can be sustained.

And now, lest you should not clearly understand the terms and application of the proposed remedy for slavery—*Immediate Emancipation*—I will explain. You have observed, that the slavery of the United States, is not the mere creature of chance and lawless custom; but the long since adopted child of statute enactments. It is asserted, sanctioned, and guarantied on every side, by legislative and judicial authority. Chance and usage, without express law, gave birth to and sustained it for a while. But *now* the iron bond of constitutional, legal and judicial prescription maintains its dreadful ascendancy. If slavery were now, as at first in this country, only the tolerated creature of accident, resting wholly on primary public opinion and usage, the task of its abolition would be comparatively easy. But, as matters now

stand, the most unjust and anti-christian laws must be repealed—laws which are deeply rooted in a corrupt public opinion. We have not only to persuade masters to free their slaves, but also to get the consent of the body politic, in the form of law. We cannot go to the slave and invite him to be a man, and act like a man; but we are first obliged to procure the repeal of a host of laws, which declare him and his posterity mere animal property. There is no chance for him to rise, till the pressure of an unrighteous legislation is taken off. The fundamental particulars of immediate emancipation are these :—

1. The restoration of manhood to the slave. He is now brute property, divested of all the necessary attributes of an intelligent soul. Let all those laws, which declare and hold the slave such property, be immediately repealed; and let him be legally re-converted into, what he is by nature, a *human being*. Give him a chance to rise, if he *will*—and give his friends a chance to make something of him, if they *can*. This is laying the axe at the root of the tree.

2. Let all those laws, which make the slave incapable of marriage, be immediately repealed, and others enacted in their stead, establishing the marriage relation, with all its rights and sanctions. Then would families be organized, and a home created; and all the conjugal, parental and filial obligations of religion, would be brought to bear upon the colored population.

3. Let all those laws, which exclude the slaves from the lights of education and moral instruction, be immediately repealed. And let others be enacted in their stead, providing every possible means for their enlightenment in useful knowledge, religion and morals.

4. Let all those laws, which declare slaves incapable of receiving, acquiring, holding and bequeathing property, be immediately blotted from the statute book. And let other laws be passed, encouraging them to industry and economy, and securing them in the possession of all their honest earnings.

5. Let all those laws, which incapacitate the slave to petition the civil authorities for redress under his wrongs—and all those laws which exclude his testimony against white persons—and all those laws which deny him the right to bring actions at law—and all those laws which expose him to be tried by prejudiced and interested judges—be immediately abolished. And in lieu of them, let laws be enacted, guaranteeing to all men, without exception, the right of petition, the right of giving testimony, the right of suing at the bar of public justice, and the right of an impartial trial under accusation.

6. Let all laws, which make any distinction between men, on account of their color, or any similar imaginary incapacitation, be immediately abolished. And let there be one common level of merit and demerit, of qualification and disqualification, for *all*. Let worth be deemed to 'make the *man*, and want of it the *fellow*.' If a black, red, or white person, is *non compos*, let him be provided for as such. If a black, red or white person needs to be instructed, or needs to be put under guardianship, or needs to be withholden from the exercise of the elective franchise, or is really disqualified for office, let one law of justice and equity answer for all. If a black, red, or white person, becomes a nuisance in society, or violates the wholesome laws of the State, or any how deservedly incurs

punishment, let there be one law, and one course of treatment for *all*, without respect of persons, and with *sole* respect to those considerations, which divine justice takes into account in its awards. So on the other hand, let the privilege of electing and being elected to office, be conferred on all the truly worthy, according to some scale of even-handed justice. If one man is more meritorious than another, has more real worth and capacity than another, let honor be rendered to whom honor is due.

This, my friends, is what I understand to be the doctrine of *immediate emancipation*. I have examined it to my satisfaction, and must acknowledge it to be the doctrine of God, the doctrine of Jesus Christ, the doctrine of righteousness, the doctrine of genuine republicanism. Who of you can gainsay or condemn it? What mind, free from avarice, free from pride, free from the love of domination, free from unchristian selfishness—what enlightened Christian—what hearty republican, can be opposed to this doctrine? Is there a single noble and generous sentiment, of which God has made the human heart capable, that revolts at this remedy for *slavery*? If there *be* one, I have never felt it.

Why then will not a GREAT PEOPLE, professing to be the most enlightened, moral and *free*, among the nations, frankly open their ears, their understandings, and their hearts, to the illustration of this inconceivably important subject? Alas! our country is full of anomaly and paradox. Our professions hold up to commendation every just and liberal principle of human action; but our practice abounds with the vilest examples of barbarian injustice and

cruelty. And shall those who see and feel these things be muzzled? Why are so many among the higher classes, and so many among the refuse of society, united to suppress the free discussion of the question of slavery? Why are those who *will* think and speak, compelled to recur to acknowledged, first principles of civil liberty—compelled to demonstrate *what*, sixty years ago, our gravest statesmen declared to be *self-evident* truths! I can conceive very well *how* there should exist honest differences of opinion; but how there should be such a settled determination to resist, with mobocratic force and arms, a full discussion of such a question as this, I *cannot* conceive. Nevertheless, I am bound to regard with so much respect the current objections to the doctrines and measures of the abolitionists, that I shall tax your patience long enough to give the more prominent of them an answer.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

Obj. 1. The people of the non-slaveholding States have no proper business with the question of slavery; it belongs exclusively to the people of the slaveholding States.

Ans. Slavery is one of the *highest* questions of Christian morality. It involves principles, in religion and morals, which vitally affect the present and future interests of all mankind. If slavery, with its necessary sins and evils, is of God—*is* RIGHT—all mankind have the deepest interest in shaping their conduct accordingly. If, on the contrary, slavery is of *Satan*, with all its necessary concomitants—*is* SINFUL—then, surely, all mankind are in the most perilous danger from its extension in the world.

All men have a common origin, a common nature, a common moral responsibility, a common law of eternal moral rectitude, a common interest for time and eternity, a common account to render to the Judge of all the earth, and a common liability to the righteous retributions of Him who is no respecter of persons. All men have every thing to hope from righteousness, and every thing to fear from iniquity. All men have like passions, and are acted upon, directly or indirectly, by the good and bad morals of their fellow men. Therefore, all men have a natural concern with other men's morals. It is not only their inherent right, but their bounden duty, to interest themselves in the moral conduct of their fellow men—to express their approbation of what is right, and their abhorrence of what is wrong, whenever and wherever they have occasion; whether in Asia, Africa, Europe, or America; whether in relation to what was done years ago, or is now doing. This right and duty, only become the clearer and stronger, in proportion to the proximity and intercourse of men. Have we then no business with that mass of abominations, which is included in the general denomination of American slavery—when it looms up like a dark mountain immediately before us? When it exists among our *brethren*—a people speaking the same language, dwelling in the same country, professing the same religion, subscribing to the same political creed, trafficking daily in the same marts, continually intermarrying with us, and living under the same general government—and that government an *elective Republic*! What reasonable man can endorse the assertion, that the North have no business with the slavery of the South?

But some one will say—‘The people of the free States have certainly no *political* business with slavery.’ I reply : *that* depends very much upon considerations of reciprocal obligation. Slavery is a political question at all, only in a *secondary* and *subordinate* sense. It is *primarily* and *inherently* a *moral* question. Its political bearings are all either incidental or artificial. The American people are by profession, nominally, a self-governing nation of Christians. They have nationally acknowledged the great fundamental truths of Christianity in respect to human relations as *self-evident*. This gives some naturally *moral questions* an *artificial* political aspect. The consequence is, that men cannot vote and legislate in the fear of God, and in the love of Christian principles, without frequently carrying their moral convictions into politics. And indeed, it would be an absurdity, if not a *sin*, in any man, to act upon the presumption, that what is *morally wrong* can be *politically right*.

Now if we are under no constitutional obligations to uphold and promote southern slavery—if we are under no civil, political, or legal liabilities, in respect to the maintenance of it—in a word, if it has no political business with *us*; *then* have we no political business with *that*. But what are the facts?

Firstly. Have we not covenanted with our slaveholding brethren in the Federal Constitution, to give them the important privilege of representing all their slaves in Congress, in the ratio of three-fifths? Also, the like advantage of us in the election of President? For their ease and profit, they treat their slaves like cattle at home; but in order that we may be well

governed, we have allowed them to reckon those cattle three-fifths human. By virtue of this one sided bargain, (which, however, we must stand to, till we can honorably amend it,) the slaveholders of the South have now some *twenty-five* representatives in Congress—ready to vote and act in all emergencies, as the interest of their cause requires. How do those twenty-five representatives hold their seats there? By virtue of slave property—treated at home as a brute inheritance, but by our constitutional guarantee convertible, in this solitary respect, into a fractional humanity. Well; are these twenty-five representatives the advocates and guardians of those slaves, in whose name they claim their seats? No. They do not sit there to watch for opportunities to meliorate the wretched lot of their passive constituents; but, like so many jealous sentinels around a body of groaning prisoners, to alarm their whole troop, at the first intimation of a rescue. Let a petition be presented in behalf of the slaves, and these are the men to cry out—‘Throw it out of doors, or under the table!’ ‘Expel the man that insults the House by its presentation!’ ‘He ought to be in a penitentiary!’ Let a new slave State apply for admission into the Union, with its constitution disgraced by the most anti-republican provisions; and let our northern representatives dare to say, ‘it ought not to be admitted till purged of its slavery;’ then, lo! what a storm of indignation bursts from these slave constituted champions of liberty. ‘It *shall* come in as it is—we want its strength to keep down the fanatics here.’ So they vote it in; and we, accommodating creatures, comfort

ourselves with the notion that after all, it is none of our business.

Texas, a territory belonging to Mexico, lately invaded by our refuse brigands, and since declared independent, is about to be thrust into the Union by the same kind of management. It is said to be large enough to make six or eight great slaveholding States. The South, with their extra twenty-five members, are undoubtedly determined to drag this stolen province into our Union—all for the better government of the country, and especially the keeping down of northern fanatics. Florida, too, is about to knock for admission, as a sister State. And we have every reason to apprehend, that all the advantages we have conferred on the slaveholding class, in the constitution, will be brought to bear against our convictions of justice and right. We are politically bound to let them wield the whip which we have thus placed in their hands. But surely, we are not bound to surrender all our other rights—rights quite as solemnly guarantied to us in the constitution, as any of theirs. Surely, we may be permitted to anticipate what will be the effect of this slaveholding advantage upon our posterity, *forty years hence*, when 10 or 12 millions of slaves, will crowd Congress with this odd sort of representation. At least, we ought to have the undisputed right to think and talk.

Secondly. We have bound ourselves in the constitution, to deliver up to their masters on demand all fugitive slaves. This is another great wrong to which our hands have been tied. We wince under it, but have only the method of free discussion left us, for getting rid of the odious office. If we can so enlighten public

opinion as to obtain the abolition of slavery, we shall experience no harm from the letter of the obligation. But as things now are, we are continually called on to fulfil the terms of this unholy league. Slavery finds political business enough with us. By and by, if any event should occur to drive half a million of slaves over the line, with their pursuers at their heels, we may be obliged to raise an army and march them back again to their whipping posts. Yet we have no political, no constitutional business with slavery? I do not understand such logic. I do not understand how we are bound to do all the drudgery that slavery happens to require, but are wholly cut off from the right of contriving ways and means to countervail its evils.


Thirdly. We are constitutionally obligated, in case of insurrection among the slaves at the South, to furnish men and money sufficient to restore their master's absolute authority over them. If ten men, or ten thousand, or a million, are demanded for this purpose, they must march. If ten dollars, or ten thousand, or ten millions, or five hundred millions of dollars are requisite to pay the bill, we must pay it. A few years hence, when those slaves shall have increased to *five, seven, or ten* millions, a general insurrection in mid-summer, from Maryland to Mexico, would furnish us with quite as much *hunting and murdering*, as we should be able to perform. But hard as it may seem, our treasure, our lives, our very heart's blood, are all bonded for the maintenance of slavery, to the very capes of Florida, the prairies of Arkansas, the swamps of Louisiana, and perhaps to the farthest Alligator swamps of Texas. And how soon an insulted God will cease to restrain his thun-

ders, and permit the earthquake to burst, no mortal can foresee. How soon our young men, our sons and brothers, will be summoned to feed the reptiles and wild beasts of southern quagmires with their putrid flesh, that God only knows. But *one* thing I know, that so long as we bear the forms of humanity, and rest under such obligations as these, it is an outrage on our common sense to tell us—‘*You have no business with the question of slavery.*’ Business, indeed! Yes, we have business with all the dangers and difficulties of slavery, but none with its fancied profits. God be thanked that we are not obliged to bear about such a canker in our pockets. Our constitutional business is to maintain and defend slavery with our *lives* and *fortunes*, but we have no political right to discuss the subject!!! Where is the man that can reason himself into such a shameless conclusion? If our southern brethren *readily* wish us to consider ourselves constitutionally, and politically divorced from this subject, let them untie our hands from our dreadful obligations. Let them surrender their unnatural advantage of governing us, by virtue of their animal property. Let them say before God and the world, ‘we take the whole responsibility of slavery’—‘the blood be upon us and upon our children only.’ Then will we more willingly admit, that we have no political business with slavery.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, &c.

Fourthly. Against slavery in the States, we have no direct legislative power. We can speak, write, print, and in various ways exert an influence on public opinion, but cannot directly act upon the evil. Our duty is done, when we have gone to the extent of our moral means.

But not so with respect to slavery in the District of Columbia and the frontier territories. There we occupy common ground with the South. There it is for the representatives of the free States, (they being a majority,) to say whether slavery shall be tolerated or abolished. In these domains Congress has the absolute control—the *right* of ‘exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever.’ If slavery lives there, it lives by the permission and authority of Congress. The whole nation, as one people, is responsible for all the slavery which exists within these limits. When the District of Columbia became the seat of government, it had only a few hundred slaves; now it has about 7,000. Then it was but an ordinary slave market; now it is one of the greatest and most infamous on this side of Guinea. There the licensed slave merchant builds his prisons, chains and unchains his human merchandise, buys and sells the miserable creatures that come in his way, and ships them off by hundreds to the burning South. There he pays the price of his license to our rulers, and leaving it in our treasury, affects to consider himself a man of honorable occupation. There, the public prisons, built with the whole people’s money, open and shut their heavy doors at the will of slaveholders. There the prowling kidnapper lurks, to snatch up every colored citizen whom he has the least prospect of smuggling through the forms of law into slavery. There our laws allow such unprincipled wretches to prey upon the innocent—to take up and imprison any colored man on suspicion, as a runaway slave—to compel him to prove his freedom—then, if this cannot be done, to throw upon him all the expenses of

suspecting and unjustly imprisoning him—then to get him sold to pay these expenses, then to hurry him whence he can never return. There, within sight of that noble Capitol, over which the star spangled banner of the republic floats, and whose halls reverberate the eloquence of our senatorial wisdom—gangs of hand-cuffed slaves are driven along, by mounted drivers, cracking their whips upon the backs of their victims. It was there, directly before that Capitol, that as a cofile of manacled slaves were driven along a few years ago—one of them lifted up his pinioned hands as high as possible, and struck up the song  ‘Hail Columbia, *happy* land!’ There, the ambassadors of all monarchical Europe gaze on the spectacle of our hypocrisy, pride, avarice and cruelty. Thence they write home to their masters, glorious descriptions of American republicanism—putting all the Courts of Europe in a titter of contempt at our hollow-hearted devotion to liberty. Oh! it is enough to make angels weep, and patriots smite their breasts in desperation!

Now, by whose will and pleasure are all these things so? By the will and pleasure of the whole American people. Their representatives have either adopted and confirmed, or formally enacted, all these laws. It is *our* representatives who have done, and who are doing and permitting all the evils of slavery, within the District of Columbia and the Territories. A majority of those representatives are from the free States. They might put away these evils at will. But where are the people of these free States? What are they doing? What do they care about these things? If it were not for a few, *nick-named fanatics*, half of them

would never come to the knowledge of these facts, and the other half would give themselves no concern with a reform. And even now, when we endeavor to arouse the people to their duty, behold we are bidden to mind our own business; for that this question of slavery is one with which we have no constitutional right to meddle. Is it so? Shall the free sons of the North, nursed on the milk of liberty, breathing the air of freedom, be forbidden to speak and act on this subject! In the language of Patrick Henry, let each of us say—‘Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death!’ When we commit treason in the execution of such a determination, let the majesty of the laws assert their claim to our lives. It will then be time enough to secure the forfeiture.

DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

Obj. 2. If the North continue to discuss and agitate this question of slavery, the South will certainly dissolve the Union.

Ans. Will the South dissolve the Union, if we keep within our constitutional bounds? Will they dissolve the Union, if we exercise no other than our clear moral and political rights? This is as far as abolitionists intend to go. At all events, if they should go further, there are better laws than those of Judge Lynch to punish them. If the South are so lost to all sentiments of honor, as well as motives of interest, that they will rush into a great wrong, because we persist in a righteous pursuit, by lawful

means, on constitutional grounds—who will then be in fault? who will be the traitors to their country? Shall we be asked to refrain from doing right, because they threaten to do wrong? Let it be made to appear that we are giving *just* cause of offence, that we are transcending our unquestionable rights—that we are doing *wrong*, and then will we desist. Threatenings will not then be necessary to terminate the agitation. But of all reasons in the world, a threat of violence by men who are manifestly in the wrong is the weakest why men of principle should cease to reprove iniquity. Besides, must we surrender the most sacred rights and liberties, secured to us under the Federal Constitution, in order to preserve that very Union which was established as the hallowed palladium of these rights? If we suffer our liberties to be ravished from the ark of our Testament, and out of comity to slaveholders, allow them to make slaves of us and all our posterity, what will our Union then be worth? It will be worth just what it now is to the negroes—that is to say, it will effectually serve the purpose of keeping on our chains. ‘Resist beginnings,’ was the ancient adage of the wise. If we *begin* to yield our constitutional rights, for the sake of soothing slave-drivers, and winning their favor will they not ultimately take the *whole*? We must adhere to our lines at the summit of the hill; for if we once begin to retreat, they will push us to the bottom. As the late President once said—‘*we must ask nothing but what is right, and submit to nothing that is wrong.*’

To understand the value of our Union, we should consider its *basis* and *bond*. Its basis

is the Declaration of Independence. Its bond is the present Federal Constitution. Now the Declaration of Independence thus speaks:— ‘ We hold these truths to be *self-evident*, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.’ *Abolitionists* hold these truths to be self-evident; and they will devotedly maintain the union of these States on this basis. Do southern slave masters hold these truths to be ‘self-evident’? Will they adhere to the Union on this basis? If so, the North and the South will never contend, except in laudable emulation, which shall most honor such principles. But have not our southern brethren become already recreant to this creed? Have they not heretically asserted that ‘all men are *not* created equal?’ Have they not bold affirmed, that millions of their fellow men are *not* entitled to the unalienable rights of liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? And are they not angry with us, because we stick too tenaciously to the old creed? On that old creed, let them remember, our Union was based by its authors. And now, because we will not allow them to undermine this basis at their pleasure, will they dissolve the Union? And if they do so, will northern patriots blame *us* for the result?

Now for the bond of our Union. What says its preamble? ‘ We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, ESTABLISH JUSTICE, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY to ourselves and our posterity, do or-

dain and establish this Constitution.' Hear the language of one of its articles. 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH, or of the PRESS; or the *right* of the people peaceably to *assemble*, and to *petition* the government for a *redress* of *grievances*.'

Abolitionists love this bond of Union. They will sacrifice as much and suffer as long for its preservation as any other class of their countrymen. They long to see 'JUSTICE' established throughout the land. They ardently desire that the 'BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY' may be secured to this whole people and their posterity. If southern slaveholders are for these things, there will be no unfriendly contention. But if those slaveholding brethren are resolved on *estoblishing injustice*, and on securing the *blessings* [curses] of *slavery*, to themselves and their posterity: if to this end, they are bent on passing laws to abridge our *freedom of speech*, the *press*, *assemblage*, and *petition*; then, before *all* the world, we charge *them* with hostility to the *Union*—then would it be plain to the most obtuse intellect, that the Union, as they would have it, was not the Union of our fathers; but *that Union perverted*, *that Union* wrong side up, and wrong side out—*another Union*, based on the doctrine of *natural inequality*, and *artificial tyranny*. Such a Union we do not want. If we cannot have the old Union, on its own original basis, and with its own original bond, we want no *perverted* one. For the genuine Union, abolitionists will do and suffer all things—but if a metamorphosed Union be substituted, look to it who will, we can have neither part nor lot in the treason.

Now have we transcended our boundaries of constitutional liberty, in seeking the abolition of slavery? We are indeed utterly opposed to slavery; we mean to leave no fair means untried to effect its abolition. All this we fearlessly avow; but have we taken any unrighteous means? have we broken the Constitution? have we violated the laws? have we used any other than those very liberties, which all America acknowledges, are agreeable to the supreme law of the land? If we *have*, let us be tried and punished as felons and traitors. If *not*, let us not be silenced, on the ground, that if we exercise our rights the South will commit treason and suicide. If we could be deterred from our duty by such pitiful considerations, we should make ourselves the laughing stock, not only of the whole civilized world, but of the very people at whose threats we quailed.

If the Union will stand on its own basis, cemented by its own bond, it shall never be either overthrown or undermined by abolitionists. But if rash and unhallowed hands are laid upon it by our southern countrymen, the sin will lie at *their door*; and upon their heads must fall the woful consequences of its destruction. Such madness on their part would be an infallible token that the forbearance of Heaven was exhausted, and that they had been abandoned to those tremendous retributions, which Jefferson anticipated. What would they do with 3000 miles of hostile frontier—half of it skirted with Indian savages burning with the treasured revenge of ages, and irritated by thousands of recent wrongs? What would they do with nearly 3,000,000 of natural enemies spread

over the whole face of their country. Where are their materials for such armies, as they must then raise for their defence? Where is their yeomanry? where are their sailors? where are their naval resources? Where are their middling-interest, and laboring freemen, to pay such direct and indirect taxes as they must then levy? What would be the protection of their coasts? What would preserve their exports from the sweep of the pirate? How would they appear in the eyes of the whole civilized world? How long would they have cause to pride themselves on their suicidal exploit? Hayti, and the liberated negro islands, would miss no opportunity of annoying them; Mexico would be their implacable enemy; the Indians would re-assert their ravished rights with yells of vengeance; and insurrection would resound amid their plantations. A large and respectable minority of their own people, who really desire the abolition of slavery as much as we do, would flee from a devoted land. Like the disciples of Christ, retiring from Jerusalem on the eve of its destruction, these brethren of ours would leave all behind, and throw themselves into the bosom of the free States. You show signs of incredulity at this. So often and so long have you heard that the South was a *unit*, you doubt the abolitionism of its inhabitants. Do not, my friends, imagine that all your southern brethren are tyrants and madmen. Do you need to be told, that several of the most efficient abolitionists are southerners? Do you need to be told, that thousands of prayers are every day going up from the southern country to Heaven for the success of this cause? Rest assured, that as certainly as we

at the North have our apologists for slavery, and our miserable pro-slavery mobites, they, at the South, have their *elect thousands*, who have never bowed the knee either to Baal or Moloch. Their hearts are with our hearts, and in the day of trial, their hands will be with our hands.

The threatened dissolution of the Union is therefore no objection to the doctrine of immediate emancipation, or to its fearless promulgation.

EXCITING INSURRECTION.

Obj. 3. The abolitionists are exciting the slaves to insurrection, instigating them to insubordination, violence and blood-shed.

Ans.. We deny it; and challenge our accusers to bring a particle of proof. Let us have such proof, and the guilty shall be delivered up to the rigors of the law. These charges, though so often made, were never seriously believed. If so, why have not the authors of such wickedness been arrested, tried, condemned and punished? Has there been any want of a disposition to crush abolitionists? Where are their incendiary publications, and their blood-thirsty counsels? Who has ever pointed them out? Yet the mails have been ransacked, and the doors of anti-slavery book depositories thrown wide open, by the accused themselves, to the keenest scrutiny of their enemies. Why have they never been arraigned, except at the court of Judge Lynch? I will tell you why—simply because no other than Lynch law exists against them. And what is more, intelligent men at the South are well convinced that this whole *cut-throat* accusation is an unfounded surmise of weak or wicked

minds. The testimony of Gen. Duff Green, in the *Southern Review*, is conclusive on this point :

‘ We are of those who believe the South has nothing to fear from a servile war. We do not believe that the abolitionists intend, nor could they, if they would, excite the slaves to insurrection. The danger of this is remote. We believe that we have most to fear from the organized action upon the consciences and fears of slaveholders themselves; from the insinuations of their dangerous heresies into our schools, our pulpits, and our domestic circles. It is only by alarming the consciences of the weak and feeble, and diffusing among our own people a morbid sensibility on the question of slavery, that the abolitionists can accomplish their object. *Preparatory to this*, they are now laboring to saturate the non-slaveholding States with the belief that slavery is a sin against God; that the ‘national compact’ involves the non-slaveholders in that sin; and that it is their duty to toil and suffer, that our country may be delivered from what they term its blackest stain, its foulest reproach, its deadliest curse.’

General Green understands us. This is precisely what we are endeavoring to do. Let us hear no more of abolition incendiarism. So far from exciting the slaves to insurrection, abolitionists have uniformly counselled them, to suffer wrong rather than do wrong; to abstain from all revenge and violence; to submit even to their *froward* masters: and to hope for deliverance at the hand of God. The proofs of this pacific and christian advice can be adduced, whenever demanded, in the shape of ample quotations from their books, tracts, constitutions and reported speeches. In the mean time, it is true, they have redoubled their efforts upon the masters—endeavoring to make them feel, that the patient suffering of the poor slaves only heightened their guilt. This objection is removed, and I proceed.

HARSH AND ABUSIVE LANGUAGE.

Obj. 4. Abolitionists denounce slavery in too harsh, abusive and inflammatory language.

Ans. Grant they are at fault in this respect ; is it a *crime* ? does it justify the rejection of their doctrines and general measures ? Have they had no cause, in the nature and magnitude of the evil attacked, to be zealous and severe ? Are the abominations of slavery so few and tolerable, that these men, here and there aroused to the contemplation of its horrors, while all around them were torpid, might have been expected to speak softly ? Have they generally received that kind of treatment from slaveholders and their abettors, which is most calculated to soothe the temper of man into serenity. All *unnecessary* harshness and bitterness, is, of course, to be avoided in the great labors of moral reform. But who is to judge what forms of expression against sin, are *unnecessarily* harsh and severe ? Our Lord Jesus Christ, the greatest and gentlest of reformers, sometimes denounced the wicked in high places, in a style of severity, beyond which even abolitionists have scarcely gone. Would it not be more just if the guilty first repented, and then complained ? Or, if complaint must be made, would it not be more just to arraign those distinguished men, dead and living, who wrote before the rise of modern anti-slavery, and who have left on record a testimony against slavery, as essentially offensive, as the ebullitions of the present *so called* fanatics ?

But taking the case in its worst possible form—if you reject abolitionism because of its harsh, abusive and violent language, where will you go to find any thing better ? Will you turn

yourselves round into the pro-slavery ranks? Is their vocabulary of epithets and vituperation, so much more chaste, classical, modest and conciliatory than that of the abolitionists, that you may gain by the preference? Are either their words or actions to be commended, by a man of principle and conscience? These questions answer themselves, and at the same time annihilate the objection under notice. Let those worthy people who think the abolitionists are in a good ship, but have more sail than ballast, just come on board and steady the helm. They will then have it much more completely in their power to set small matters right, than they now have, by finding fault from the enemy's deck. Let them come in and set us better examples. We want the benefit of all their prudence and moderation.

INJURING THE SLAVES.

Obj. 5. The efforts of Abolitionists only injure the slaves. They alarm the slaveholder, and provoke him, in self defence, to abridge the liberties and comforts of his slaves.

Ans. This was precisely the effect on Pharaoh, and his slaveholding princes; insomuch that the Israelites begged of Moses to leave them to their fate. But we do not learn that God ordered Moses to refrain. On the contrary, he commanded him to persevere—seconding his exertions for their liberation with the most tremendous judgments on the Egyptians. When the tale of bricks is doubled and the straw withheld, and the lash of the task-master quickened on the bleeding back of the slave, deliverance may be known to be at hand. The out-stretched arm of an avenging God will soon appear for the relief of the oppressed.

If our southern brethren are so lost to all that is just and generous, as to vent the revenge and indignation, which they feel towards us, on their innocent slaves, it is a new and horrible proof of their guilt. And instead of operating to deter us from our efforts for the abolition of slavery, it ought only to stimulate us to more vigorous exertions. It is a token that the Almighty is about to rise to the work of redemption.

SOCIETIES AND LECTURES UNNECESSARY.

Obj. 6. At least, there is no need of forming Anti-Slavery Societies, and sending about itinerant Lecturers. This only provokes and exasperates the South.

Ans. Shall I tell you why this provokes and exasperates the South? Just because it is an effective mode of reforming public opinion, and bringing it to bear with a direct force against the evil of slavery. Is this any reason why we should relinquish such a mode of operation? Is it wrong, or unconstitutional, or treasonable, to form these Societies? Are they not peaceable, voluntary associations, for a laudable object? Is it improper or censurable, to endeavor a wholesome revolution of public opinion, by means of congenial combination, public lectures, and the diffusion of printed information? If we were machinating rebellion, plotting treason, and secretly enlisting soldiers, there would be some sense in the outcry raised against our social operations.

Perhaps, however, it will be urged, that these voluntary combinations tend to create a tyranny of public opinion. *That* can never be a tyranny, which establishes public opinion on the

side of righteousness, justice, truth and mercy. In such a country as ours, there will always be a strong controlling public opinion, on one side or the other of every great subject, question, and interest. Public opinion is the helm of a republican government, by which the whole vessel is controlled. So the alternative is only this—to have a *right* or a *wrong* public opinion; for one or the other is inevitable. I contend, that a *right* public opinion is not a tyranny; but that a *wrong* public opinion is *necessarily* such. For instance, a general public opinion in favor of duelling, or in favor of profanity, or in favor of intemperance, or in favor of debauchery, or in favor of slavery, is in its very nature tyrannical. Such a public opinion invariably besots, degrades, and crushes the multitude. But a strong public opinion in favor of peace, or in favor of divine reverence, or in favor of temperance, or in favor of chastity, or in favor of liberty, is naturally and necessarily *liberal* and salutary. Such a public opinion reforms, improves and blesses all classes of society. If a sound public opinion against slavery, injustice, outrage, and every species of immorality, be a tyranny, then, surely, God and all heaven are on the side of tyranny; which hint is of itself sufficient to silence the objection before us. Hitherto public opinion in this country has been on the side of slavery. It is changing; and will finally take the other side, sweeping that relict of barbarism before it into everlasting oblivion. Then it will be no tyranny—and its mobbish wrath will have ceased forever.

AMALGAMATION.

Obj. 7. The abolitionists are for amalga-

tion. They are for mixing up the races into one indiscriminate mulatto posterity.

Ans. Whence comes this objection? Does it come from the slaveholder, and the slaveholder's apologist? So it would seem. But surely it comes with an ill grace from such a quarter. Is there no amalgamation at the South? no bleaching of the Ethiopian skin? no mulatto making? Whence came those myriads of yellow slaves; aye, those thousands of quattoons, &c. &c., some of whom are even fairer and whiter than their owners? Are slaveholders so chaste, and so cautious of giving life to offspring with colored skins—so averse to mixing their noble blood with that of an inferior race, that the horrid abolitionists are an abomination to them, on account of favoring amalgamation? Shame on such hypocritical cant. Do we need to be informed that the whole mass of female slaves, are continually exposed to the filthy lusts of masters, overseers and drivers? Is it any news to us, that every gentleman planter, his sons, and visitors, can prostitute their colored servants at pleasure? Do we not know that some of the most aristocratical blood of the South is creeping at this moment through the veins of slaves? Who that has familiarized himself with the manners of the southern cities, cannot tell us of the fashionable concubinage, and harem-like luxuries of slaveholders? Alas! the customs of the country, I had almost said, its morality, allows the greatest and most honorable among the people to beget offspring, when and where they please—*provided*, they are only inhuman enough to disown, inbrute and traffic them away like cattle. If report does not lie, our present Vice President

has received more scorn and opposition from the South, on account of treating *some* of his offspring as a father, than for every thing else besides. That which really does him the most honor, they deem his greatest disgrace. And yet, they and their friends denounce the abolitionists as amalgamators. Let them look at home and repent. We advise all men and women to keep themselves pure, till they can unite together innocently and honorably, as husband and wife—and in doing this, to seek congenial partners of their own general complexion and condition in life. But if they will not follow this advice; and will otherwise incongruously mix together—let them be held to their choice, and compelled to treat each other and their offspring like human beings;—not carry on a wholesale operation of lawless prostitution and bastardy, as is done, under the corrupt system of slaveholding amalgamation. These are our doctrines; and wherever they are understood, we shall hear no more of the objection, that we are for amalgamation.

THE NEGROES ARE AN INFERIOR RACE.

Obj. 8. The negroes are an inferior race. They are incapable of freedom and civil government. It is of no use to attempt their improvement. They are fit only for a state of slavery.

Ans. I pity the man who can seriously urge such an objection as this. I must deem his head or his heart, or both, disordered. It is but the groundless assertion of men, who themselves need a guardian, or a keeper. A thousand historical facts, a thousand facts of our own times, the contrivances of the slave system

to prevent the rise of its victims, reason, revelation, and observation, are all against this insane conclusion. The Africans are *men*—created by the same God, and of one blood with ourselves. They are capable of respectable attainments in all the arts, sciences, and morals of civilized life. Jesus Christ died for them, as well as for us. Heaven is as accessible to them as to us. They will stand before the same judgment-seat with us, before a Judge, who will give the master no preference over his slave. If the degradation of slavery has sunk the colored people of our country below their natural level, and *ever* so far below *us*, *that* is no reason why we should add wrong to wrong, by treading them still deeper in the mire. On the other hand, it is a good reason, why we should undo our wrongs, and endeavor to restore their broken nature to soundness. I disdain to go into arguments showing our obligations to provide for, protect, instruct, encourage, reform and elevate these our unfortunate brethren. This is too plain to require argument. And we may rest assured, that we can never discharge our obligations, nor accomplish any thing to the purpose, without first terminating slavery.

SLAVES BETTER OFF THAN FREE BLACKS.

Obj. 9. It is of no use to liberate the slaves. The southern free colored people are, at least a great majority of them, in a worse condition than the slaves. The slaves even look down upon them with contempt.

Ans. Grant that a large majority of the free blacks are in a worse condition than the slaves; what is the cause of it? Is freedom the cause

of it? If so give them slavery. But who does not see that it is slavery, not freedom, which keeps them down? They are themselves *slaves* of another *caste*, not freemen. The laws are all against them. The interests of the slaveholders are all against them. The fears, envy and hatred of the whites are against them. They need emancipation, as well as the nominal slaves; and nothing but the utter abolition of the system of slavery can give them their rights. What chance, what encouragement, have they to rise? What guards, or facilities, do the laws afford them for becoming men. The greatest marvel is, that so many of them rise as high as they do. Law, custom, jealousy, revenge and fear, all concur to thrust them beyond the pale of civilization. And as if these were not enough to destroy them, a mercenary tribe of intoxication venders, are permitted to allure them on every hand into their haunts. Let no man suppose that we look at the free blacks as a sample of what the slaves are to be made, when emancipated. Both classes will be emancipated by the same process—and rise together into manhood when their common pressure is taken off. If we succeed in redeeming the slaves, we shall succeed in renovating the nominally free blacks. I consider this objection answered.

DANGER OF IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION.

Obj. 10. Immediate emancipation would be infinitely dangerous. The slaves would fly from labor, rush on their late masters, with the instruments of extermination—would abandon themselves to the commission of every brutal outrage—would trample under foot all law, order and decency.

Ans. How many thousand times has this frightful objection been repeated, since the commencement of abolition efforts in Great Britain? How many thousand timid minds, otherwise estimable for their virtues, have been terrified by it? But happily how have facts uniformly and incontestibly refuted it? The whole history of the African, yes, of the *human* race, gives it the lie. While we have a multitude of the most undeniable facts, to demonstrate that the emancipation of slaves, in good faith, kindly, freely, and generously, is practicable, safe, salutary, and advantageous, to all parties concerned—an instance to the contrary cannot be found in the annals of the world. ‘The horrors of St. Domingo,’ are often ignorantly referred to as a case in point. But better information concerning those horrors turns the case completely in our favor. For, instead of the bloody atrocities committed in that Island having arisen from immediate emancipation, they were excited by an abominable attempt to reduce the free to *immediate slavery*.

About the time of the French revolution, this French Colony of St. Domingo, partook in the effervescence of the mother country. The Republican party became involved in a civil strife with the Aristocracy. Being numerically and politically in the ascendant, the Republicans proclaimed the immediate emancipation of all the slaves. The Aristocratic party called in the British to assist them. The Republicans then armed the slaves for the common defence. The British were held at bay; and as France had business enough at home, the Colony was left for several years, to its own management. By such means, 500,000 slaves

were instantly made free. Col. Malenfant, a most credible witness, then resided on the Island ; and the following is his testimony :—
 ‘ After this public act of emancipation, the negroes remained quiet, both in the South and West ; and they continued to work upon all the plantations. Even upon those estates which had been abandoned by their owners and managers, the negroes continued their labors, where there were any agents to guide ; and where no white men were left to direct them, they betook themselves to planting provisions. The Colony was flourishing. The whites lived happy and in peace upon their estates, and the negroes continued to work for them.’ Gen. Lacroix, another competent witness, thus speaks in his memoirs of that period :—‘ The Colony marched as by enchantment towards its ancient splendor ; cultivation prospered ; every day produced perceptible proofs of its progress.’ This prosperity continued eight years, till Bonaparte sent an army to reduce the blacks again to slavery. Then sprang up the far-famed ‘ horrors of St. Domingo.’ So great a difference is there, between doing right and doing wrong ; between proclaiming immediate emancipation, and attempting immediate subjugation. Men will fight and die for liberty ; but who ever knew them to fight and murder, because they were emancipated. It is always safe to do right—always dangerous to do wrong ; always safe to love and bless our race—always dangerous to hate and crush it.

LET THEM BE SENT OUT OF THE COUNTRY.

Obj. 11. If the blacks must be emancipated, let them be shipped off to their own coun-

try. Let them go where they belong ; we do not want them here ; the two races can never dwell together ; send them to Africa and let them civilize it.

Ans. Although such emigrants would hardly be qualified for the work of civilization ; yet we have no objection to their colonizing Africa, if they please. They have the same liberty to go to Africa, that their European brethren have to go to Europe ; and probably they would carry as much human improvement into their father continent, as their masters would into theirs.

But, say you, ' Let them be shipped off, whether they are willing or not—send them home—we have had enough of them.' You mean, that having extorted from them all we can, and stripped them of every thing but life, we have no further use for them. Very generous and kind, indeed ! Where did we learn such a morality as this ? The southern landholders, however, tell us, that if we take away their blacks, we shall also take away their country, since the blacks *only* can cultivate the soil. Perhaps, we had better retain enough to do their work, at fair wages. And as for the rest, they are as much in their own country, as we are. They are not Aboriginal Americans ; neither are we. Their ancestors came from Africa, ours from Europe ; and *here*, we are in the red man's country. If there is to be any shipping off without consent, we had better let the Indian say who shall be sent home. I dare say he would colonize Europe quite as liberally as we would Africa. At all events, he would be justified in making room to spread his blanket and dig him a grave, among the bones of his progenitors. My friends, when we look at it,

just as it is, there is something quite as ludicrous as there is wicked, in this notion of transporting the colored people to their *own country*. No man can reflect a moment, without seeing that *this* is as much *their* country as ours; that Europe is as much our home as Africa is theirs; and that there is no more justice in shipping them to *their* father land, than in shipping their master's to *theirs*. We had better make up our minds 'to do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with God,' when undoubtedly the Almighty will take care that we are not stifled by disagreeable odors, nor crazed by unseemly colors.

GRADUAL EMANCIPATION.

Obj. 12. Any how, if there must be an emancipation, it is clear that it should be *gradual*, (not immediate) to prepare the slaves for liberty.

Ans. Let the South propose a plan of gradual emancipation, which they are prepared to enter upon in good faith—and we will give it at least, a candid consideration. Or let their northern friends propose one, which they will recommend to the South with all their influence. It would have the merit of being *curious*, if no other. It would be pleasing to know what slave laws and customs were to be repealed—and what others adopted in their stead. It would be amusing to run through a theoretical process, by which the slaves are to be gradually turned into *men*, gradually invested with the rights of marrying, being instructed, making contracts, acquiring property, suing at law, testifying in court, &c. To save words on this topic, I challenge the wisdom of the world to invent any scheme of *de-*

sirable emancipation, which can be applied to the case of the slaves—that does not start with proclaiming them *men*. The right of man to himself is the first right to be restored. Slavery denies this right. Let it be restored to the slave, and he ceases to be a slave. Till this is done, you can do nothing for him as a rational being; you can only deal with him as an animal. Give him back this right, and all that slavery denies him must follow. Withhold this, and all that slavery can permit to be done for him, leaves him still a slave. There is no such thing as a gradual abolition of slavery in the individual. He is a slave till he is a free-man. Preparatory measures may *precede* abolition; and sanative measures may *attend* the work, and measures of improvement may *follow* after; but emancipation itself cannot be a *gradual process*.

REMUNERATION.

Obj. 13. The slaveholder ought to be remunerated, if his slaves are emancipated; but abolitionists discard this doctrine, and propose to rob the southern people of all their slave property.

Ans. We deny that they have any right of property in their colored fellow creatures. If they can prove that they have any such property in them, upon any ground of justice, we agree that they may retain it; and if we take it away from them, we agree to be answerable for it. This is the very question which lies at the foundation of the subject. Let it be proved that they have a rightful property in their slaves, and our work is done—their slavery would then be acknowledged no more slavery,

than our owning of cattle. But we deny this. It is this very pretension to property in their slaves, which we hold to be the mother sin of the system. Let them prove their claim—not by their own selfish and tyrannical statutes, but by the eternal truths of nature, revelation, and reason. It is a clear case, that if a man should steal me and sell me to another, the latter would have the same right of property in me, that our southern countrymen have in their slaves. There is no right in the case. ‘*Might gives right,*’ is the only maxim, according to which slave property can be holden.

But if we must talk of remuneration, let us first remunerate the slave. Or, if a bargain can be made, let us agree upon an arbitration between the master and his slave. The master shall stand as heir and successor on the one side, and the slave as heir and successor on the other. Then let the master bring in his bill for all that he and his predecessors have expended on his slave and ancestors. And let the slave be credited for all that he and those to whom he is heir have earned. Then, if any balance falls to the master, the abolitionists will square the account. But if it turns out that an immense balance is due to the slave, and he is willing to forgive the debt, and take care of himself, let us hear no more about remuneration.

I firmly believe, that all those masters’ who will emancipate their slaves in good faith, according to the manifest dictates of justice, and then employ them at fair wages, will themselves gain in property by the experiment. This has been the case in numerous instances, and is, in the very nature of things, a probable result.

The slaves on their emancipation want employment. They are willing to work for moderate wages. For such wages they will work better, than as slaves. When they have got their wages, they are ready to expend them in obtaining food, clothing, education, homes, and all the comforts of civilization. They then form into families, and become consumers on a continually increasing scale. Their late masters, if just and kind, become their natural factors, through whom their growing wants are to be supplied, and in whose hands the fair profits of transition will remain. What more do they wish? Is it more pleasing to compel the reluctant toil of a gang of half-naked slaves, than to promote their free labor at less expense, with less danger and to more profit, while seeing them at the same time rise to the rank of men? It seems to me, that if ever the planters of the South view things as they are, they will deem it as *politic*, as it is *just*, to emancipate their slaves—and *that*, without any other than the consequential remuneration, which naturally flows from such acts of justice.

GO TO THE SOUTH.

Obj. 14. Well, if you are determined to abolish slavery, go where it is—go to the South and do your preaching. The North are all opposed to slavery—there is but one opinion here on that point—we are all opposed to slavery.

Ans. When we are convinced of this, we will go to the South. At present we doubt the assertion that every body at the North is opposed to slavery. Actions speak louder than words. Practice is better testimony than pro-

fession. I have heard of Northern kidnapers, as far back as New Hampshire ; are such miscreants opposed to slavery ? I have heard of professed slave catchers in our cities, who earn their bread by seizing and delivering up fugitives. Are these gentlemen opposed to slavery ? It is pretty well known that northern vessels are frequently engaged in the domestic slave trade, as carriers. It is more than suspected that some of the profits, even of the *foreign* slave trade, are circuitously drawn into Yankee pockets. Are such good people opposed to slavery ? It is well known that we have slaveholders all over New England—annually receiving from their distant plantations the forced earnings of '*sinews bought and sold.*' How much are *they* opposed to slavery ? Our ears have often heard vindications and apologies for slavery from northern lips, like these : —' The slaves are better off than the Negroes of Africa,'—' better off than many of our own free laborers '—' better off than they can become if freed.' ' They are contented and happy '—' they are incapable of freedom '—' they were designed by the Almighty for servitude and privation '—' they are under an irrevocable curse of slavery '—' they are fit for nothing else '—' their masters have as good a right to them, as we have to our cattle '—' slavery always has and always will exist ; it is an ordinance of God.' ' The Bible supports slavery '—' Christianity tolerates it '—' and Republicanism has nothing to do with it.' *O tell it not in Gath ! Publish it not in the streets of Askelon ! lest the uncircumcised hear thereof and triumph.* Are all these people opposed to slavery ? If they *are*, how would they speak

and act on the *other side*? If they are all opposed to slavery, the Abolitionists must certainly all be in favor of it. We are giving the same sort of evidence, that we are *for* slavery, which they are giving, that they are *against it*. But it must be confessed that this is an odd way of understanding men. Would it not be better to exercise common sense, and come to the conclusion, that the opposers of Abolitionists, speaking and acting as thousands of them do at the North, are *unopposed* to slavery? If a man were drowning and half a dozen friends were endeavoring to rescue him, but twenty other persons on shore stood pelting both the drowning man and his friends with all kinds of missiles, should we imagine that these latter were really opposed to the man's drowning? If they should *swear* that they certainly were as much opposed to the poor fellow's drowning as any body in the world, only they disapproved of rescuing him *too soon*, should we *even then*, credit their professions? 'I trow not.'

It is plain enough, that there are thousands of people at the North, who need enlightening and convincing that they have a part to act, and a solemn duty to discharge in the great work of abolishing American slavery. And fortunately, while the preliminary operation of convincing these Northern thousands is performing by us, we are at the same moment acting efficiently on the minds and consciences of the South. When, therefore, we have fulfilled our mission at the North, we will go and complete what remains unfinished at the South.

But says the objector, 'why do you not honestly own that you are afraid to carry your doc-

trines to the South? Well, we will. We acknowledge, then, that we are afraid of personal outrage and assassination at the South. We confess, with shame for our country, that vast portions of its territory are under the dominion of a vile mobocratic despotism, whose ruffian myrmidons trample under foot all the rights both of natural and constitutional liberty—torturing, scourging and murdering innocent citizens for no other crime than propagating the doctrines of their common country's declaration of independence, and for reiterating the testimony of God against slavery. Yes, we confess, with shame for this boasted land of liberty, that we can no longer deem it the land of the free, no longer tread its soil in security—no longer proclaim the great principles for which our fathers laid down their lives, without imminent danger in many places of the most dastardly personal insult and brutality. We take no shame to ourselves, but feel it only for those hypocrites, who praise liberty and practise oppression—who profess to love law and order, yet encourage the most lawless tyranny—who pretend to love a country, every inch of which has been dedicated to human freedom, but are transforming it into a country of persecuting barbarism.

And now step forward, whoever thou art, O citizen of New England, that wouldst brand us with cowardice because we decline going to the South with our doctrines; we would look thee in the face, and hear thy reasons. Approach us as the great Tempter did Christ, when he placed him on the pinnacle of the temple and bade him prove himself the Son of God, by an uncalled-for leap on the adamant

beneath. Quote scripture, *as he did*, to show that if we are of God he will 'give his angels charge' over our lives: We will then answer, as he did, 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.'

There are times and seasons of peril, in which he who would save his life in heaven must lose it on earth—in which duty calls to the endurance of privation, persecution, and martyrdom. Then the faithful prove their devotion to principle, and their moral courage, by encountering danger and death. When God calls us to this, at the North or the South, he will give us strength equal unto our day; and I trust that we shall not shrink.

If the South wish to contend on equal terms with us in a contest of reason and argument, which is our only mode of warfare; or if they wish to hear our testimony without contest, let them guarantee us a fair hearing, and we will go where they require. But if they mean to combat reason with brute force, and argument with assassination—we shall be our own judges how far to adventure our persons into their territories. We have no ambition to gratify that kind of *chivalry* which displays its prowess in such feats. Neither wild beasts nor tornadoes are the kind of opponents to be encountered with moral forces. They do not hear appeals to conscience, nor pause to consider the deductions of logic. And so long as any class of beings in the shape of men, so disgrace their rational nature as to act a similar part, it is wisdom to keep out of their way. Therefore abolitionists are fully justified, in not hazarding their lives at the South. If any of our *particular friends* are anxious to see

us clad in the honors of martyrdom, they must either get up a lynching here, or else wait till we are ready to go where such affairs are fashionable.

A GREAT POLITICAL PARTY.

Obj. 15. We know what the abolitionists are after; they are for getting up a great political party, so as to rise to office—this is enough to condemn their whole scheme.

Ans. Who says this? Who assumes to judge our motives with this assurance? If political jockeys, office holders, and blind partizans, who have spent their whole lives in political intrigues and brawlings thus speak, we can excuse them; for such men must be expected to judge others by themselves. But if modest, well principled, patriotic, honorable citizens, thus suspect and judge us, we tell them soberly and staunchly, they are doing us great wrong. So far from desiring that the abolition question should be made the basis of a great political party in this country, ninety-nine one hundredths of the abolitionists, would deprecate such a result. Their most sincere prayer is, that this question may be taken up by the influential men of all the present great political parties, as a question of pure *right and justice*. We wish to put no man into office, or out of office, because he is called a *whig* or *tory*, a federalist or democrat; but we lift up our imploring hands to our rulers, to our legislators and to our citizens, without distinction of party, beseeching them to act like Christians and republicans, in putting away the great abomination of slavery from our seat of government and from the whole land. We do not care who holds office, or what party is

uppermost, if they will only fear God, and do what is clearly their duty. Now, if the slavery question ever is made the basis of a great organized political party, it will be done against the prayers of the abolitionists, by unprincipled opposers to the mandates of justice and mercy. It will be done by men, who are madly determined to maintain slavery, against all right and reason. On such men's heads let the blame rest forever ; for it will be they alone, whose heads contrive, and whose hands execute such a mischief.

If any party or class of politicians in the United States inscribe *slavery* on their banner, as one of the great features of their system of policy, let them know, and let all the world know, that in so doing *they* take the responsibility of organizing the people into slavery and anti-slavery parties. And let me forewarn such men, to whichever of the present great political parties they belong, that such an experiment will not only compel the abolitionists to oppose them, but will arm the Almighty and all his angels against them. We want neither office, nor the loaves and fishes of office, but we want justice, righteousness and truth ; and these we are in duty bound to promote with all our influence. We consider the question, whether human beings shall be held in slavery, or secured in their natural unalienable rights, of paramount importance to all those questions, about which this nation has been disputing for years with so much political bluster. We consider it a great vital religious and moral question, which affects the destiny of mankind in the two worlds of time and eternity. And if those mighty spirits, who have kept the nation

in a political uproar, about frigates and gun-boats, British influence and French influence, aristocracy and democracy, tariff and anti-tariff measures, State rights and Federal rights, Bank and *no* Bank, gold currency and paper currency—retrenchment, internal improvement, the public money, and the public lands—if, I say, those mighty spirits imagine that the religious and moral people of the United States are to be muzzled and *trained*, on this question of slavery, in *their* ordinary political harnesses, they are miserably mistaken. They may as well think to control the tides of Funday. The spirit of the Omnipotent has come down upon the face of the waters—and the voice of his thunder is heard, saying—‘LET THERE BE LIGHT;’ and who is he that can perpetuate the reign of darkness?

These are the views of abolitionists, to the best of my knowledge and belief, on the political aims and bearings of their enterprise. What will grow out of it, I do not pretend to foresee; but one thing I know, that if there is ever a great *political* abolition party in this nation, (which may God avert,) it will be the work of their enemies, and not the result of *their own purposes*.

THE BIBLE AND CHRISTIANITY TOLERATE SLAVERY.

Obj. 16. The Bible and Christianity authorize slavery. There is therefore no occasion for Christian ministers to meddle with the subject. They had better be preaching the gospel—not interfering with political economy, and the affairs of civil government. Ministers and churches are out of their sphere when they take up the question of slavery.

Ans. O, ignorance, where is thy shame! O, impudence where is thy blush! Such an objection as this, is one with which I can have scarcely patience or parley. It deserves to be answered only with an indignant hiss. • Yet all things, even the most unreasonable and abhorrent, must be endured in defence of a good cause.

If any man at the North really believes that the Bible sanctions slavery, he must be, either an infidel or an abettor of slavery. For if he believes in the Bible, how can he be opposed to what it sanctions? And if he pretends to reverence the Bible, which he affirms justifies slavery, yet affects to be opposed to slavery, is he not clearly a hypocrite; or else, perhaps, more charitably speaking, a man beside himself—blowing hot and cold with the same breath? Furthermore, if the Bible is regarded by people among us, as authorizing slavery, and is revered—why are not our laws so remodeled, as to allow those who choose to hold slaves, to do so with impunity. We should then see who would play the tyrant.

The extreme length to which I have drawn out my discourse, admonishes me, that you cannot listen with ease to all I might deem it necessary to say on this topic. And as the whole subject of Hebrew servitude has been treated in a most masterly manner, in a late number of the *Anti-Slavery Quarterly Review*, I shall refer you to *that* for information and satisfaction, respecting the doctrine of the Old Testament. You will find it conclusive, that the Hebrew Scriptures give no shadow of support to American slavery, but are utterly repugnant to the whole system.

Concerning the doctrine of Jesus Christ and his apostles, I must be permitted briefly to speak. In doing so, however, I feel that I am attempting the demonstration of a proposition, almost as self-evident, as that the sun is in the heavens at noon. Nevertheless I will speak.

Hear the message of the angels to the shepherds of Bethlehem—‘Fear not: behold, we bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be unto all people; for unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, who is Christ the Lord.’ Good tidings of great joy were brought by these angels, which should be unto ‘ALL PEOPLE.’ Have the Africans any part in this joy? Has a Savior been born to them? Was Jesus sent to restore *them*? And is it an evidence of a Christian spirit in white people, to shut them out from all the blessings of this *universal gospel*, by holding and treating them as brutes. Who will absurdly say so?

Hear the great Redeemer himself, in the synagogue at Nazareth. ‘The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach *deliverance to the captives*, and recovering of sight to the blind; to set at *liberty them that are bruised*—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.’ Was *this* the character of Christ’s mission into the world; and yet does his religion authorise, tolerate and justify SLAVERY? Be astonished, O heavens, at the insinuation! Who so ‘*poor*’ as the slave, robbed of himself? Who so ‘*broken-hearted*’ as the slave, bereft of all that is dear? Who such a ‘*captive*’ as the slave, the prisoner of men and devils? Who so ‘*bruised*’ as the slave, ‘with stripes,

that mercy weeps to see inflicted on a beast? Does Jesus Christ preach no abolition of slavery? How can I ask such questions in a case so plain? Do reflect, my friends, but for a moment, and you will see that our Lord and Master is the very prince of abolitionists.

Hear him again: 'Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy.' 'Be ye merciful as your Father which is in heaven is merciful.' 'All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so unto them; for this is the law and the prophets.' Is slavery merciful! Does the heartless slave-driver, with his long, gory whip, imitate God, in dispensing mercy to his languishing fellow man! Is it doing unto another as a man would deem it just to be treated himself, to steal him from his native home, to tear him away from all he loves, to traffic in his soul and sinews, to rob him of his birth-right, to efface the image of God from him, to deny him marriage, to ravish away his offspring, to take all his earnings for naught—to give him no home, no family, no property, no right to defend himself, no right to bear witness against his persecutors, no right to claim protection at the bar of justice, no privilege even to petition for mercy? O, merciful Son of God, did'st thou ever intend to be so understood? I do violence to your common sense, as well as to my own feelings, by descending into these particulars. Who can misunderstand what is so plain? Yet I will go on.

Hear again: 'Neither be ye called MASTERS; for one is your Master even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant; and whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be

exalted.' 'Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, [hold them in bondage] and they that are great exercise authority upon them; [treat them as slaves] but it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant—even as the Son of man came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many.'

Is this the warrant and authority of our Lord for his disciples to make themselves 'MASTERS' of hundreds of absolute slaves? Is this *his* justification of that horrid system, which stamps under foot and crushes in the mire millions of human beings in a Christian land, whose fatal misfortune is a sable complexion? Have we professed ministers of Christ among us, engaged in sending the gospel to India, and the Bible to the Pacific Isles, and the Christian religion to the ends of the earth—who yet behold a 'nation of heathen in our midst' made and kept so by slavery—and calmly say this very slavery is perfectly compatible with the Christian religion! Doth not the voice of their miscalled Lord come thundering from heaven upon them saying—'Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I have commanded?' 'Wo unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have OMITTED THE WEIGHTIER DUTIES OF THE LAW—even *judgment, mercy, and faith.*'

The Savior solemnly forbids his followers to make themselves '*masters*;' yet we have thousands of such self-made Christian masters in our country. He solemnly forbids them to ex-


ercise lordship over each other, like the pagan Gentiles; yet we have reverend doctors and elders in our Christian church, who hold slaves, and keep many of the members of their flocks under a system of bondage, which degrades them to the condition of mere animal property. And what is worse, like the adulteress of old, they eat, and wipe their mouths and say, what evil have we done! Nor are they alone. With the voice of Christ sounding in their ears, we have non-slaveholding clergymen and laymen, who dare to say 'Christianity tolerates slavery.' Do the passages I have quoted sound like this? If they are not decidedly anti-slavery, I cannot understand the meaning of words. But to make certainty more certain, let me quote you one of the most solemn and effective anti-slavery lectures ever delivered. It was given by Christ on the occasion of the Paschal supper:

'Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God and went to God, riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments, and took a towel and girded himself. After that, he poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded.' 'After he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them. Know ye what I have done? Ye call me Master and Lord; and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought [*what? to keep a posse of ignorant slaves to wash your feet,* 'fan you when you sleep, and tremble when you wake?' No.] also to wash one another's feet. For I

have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the servant is not greater than his Lord, neither he that is sent greater than he who sent him. If ye know these things, [hear, O ye slaveholders] happy are ye if ye do them.'

Does this need comment? If so, let Paul be the commentator. 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be made rich.' 'Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took on him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man: and being found in fashion as a man, humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore, God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven, in earth, and under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is God to the glory of God the Father.'

Here we have the spirit and character of Christ and of Christianity, followed by the testimony that 'if any man have not this spirit, he is none of his.' After all this, are we to be told that slavery and slaveholding are compatible with Christianity? Are not Christ and his gospel unqualifiedly *anti-slavery*, both in precept and example? And such a gospel it was, that he commanded his disciples to go into 'all

the world and preach to **EVERY CREATURE.** Such a gospel, when fully revealed to Peter, constrained him to say—‘Of a truth, I perceive that God is no *respector* of *persons*, but in every nation he that feareth HIM and worked righteousness is accepted.’ Such a gospel Paul preached, when he declared to the Athenians, that God had made of ‘**ONE BLOOD ALL NATIONS of men.**’ Such a religion he preached to the Christian converts, who had servants, saying, ‘Masters, give unto your servants that which is **JUST and EQUAL**, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven, with whom is ‘*no respect of persons.*’ Again, ‘Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them.’ Such a religion James commended, when he said—‘The wisdom that is from above, is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy,’— the contrary of which is inseparable from slavery. Again; ‘Be not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation.’ ‘If ye fulfil the royal law according to the scripture—thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well. But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin.’ This was the religion so delightfully illustrated by the beloved John, whose epistles are one entire mass of divine anti-slavery sentiments. I will not quote more; for something presents itself to my purpose on every page of the New Testament.

Taking all this testimony into consideration, and bringing up before us *that* ‘Judgment Seat of Christ,’ before which all men must appear, to be judged without respect of persons, according to the deeds done in the body, I can-

not comprehend how any professed Christian should pretend that Christianity furnishes the least justification of slavery, or even excuses its disciples from active exertions for its abolition. It seems to me, that Christians and Christian ministers ought to be foremost and indefatigable in every measure which promises the emancipation of the enslaved.

Shall I be told that the Epistles of the New Testament recognise the relation of master and slave, without intimation of rebuke. I reply, that no such relation is recognised. The relation of master and servant is recognised without reproof, as it is now, and must always be in the present state of the world. But the quality of the servants spoken of is not specified. Neither the original word translated *servant*, nor any historical facts, necessarily pre-supposes that the *servants*, spoken of in these epistles, were *slaves* in any proper sense of the word. The same original word is applied to Christ and the apostles, and is used to denote generally a person devoted to an arduous work. It is a word applicable alike to a *slave*, and to the most distinguished public minister. There always have been and always will be, at least till a new era of the world, various forms of *bond* and *hired* service. These forms of service, with proper qualifications and regulations, imply no relations incompatible with Christianity—none incompatible with the exhortations of the apostles to believing masters and servants. But *slavery*, which makes man a mere brute for life, is incompatible with both. It is absolutely impossible for a man to imitate and obey Christ, and hold *such* a slave. It is absolutely impossible for him, to obey Paul, by giv-

ing unto *such* a slave 'that which is JUST and EQUAL.'

Will it be said that history sufficiently proves the fact, that there were slaves throughout the Roman empire in the Apostle's days. Grant it; but were they holden on such terms and under such laws as our southern slaves? Grant even this; is there any proof that Christians in the first century held such slaves? I think not. On the contrary, there is a strong presumption against it. A majority of the first converts in the Gentile cities were Jews, whose religion and peculiar circumstances render it highly improbable that they held *slaves*. Of the Gentile converts, nearly all were of the lower orders, and poorer classes of the people. 'Not many great, not many mighty, not many noble,' not many of those whose lands received the sweat of compulsory toil, had in these days become obedient to the faith. Indeed all the strength of probability is, that the primitive Christians held no SLAVES—in the true meaning of that term. If any one can make out such a fact, I shall be greatly enlightened, as well as painfully disappointed. / It would, I confess, seem inconceivably mysterious and unaccountable to me, that St. Paul and the other Apostles should have been eye-witnesses of a *slavery*, any where approaching in aggravation to *that* on our southern cotton and sugar plantations, without boldly and fearlessly denouncing it. They who hazarded their lives in rebuking the most popular idolatries of their time, could never have gone about ordaining men as elders and bishops, who lorded it over gangs of *slaves*. If this was the case, let us have the proof. Till then I will never credit

any thing so utterly repugnant to their moral character and the nature of their religion.

But finally it will be urged, that neither Christ nor the Apostles ever entered into governmental and political reforms, or sought to meliorate the condition of any degraded class of the people through the instrumentality of legislation or any civil process;—that slavery existed throughout the Roman empire, yet they neither lectured, nor formed societies, nor petitioned the authorities for its abolition.

Reply. It should also be added, that they neither professed republicanism, nor printed books, nor circulated tracts. They lived under a despotism, an almost universal *iron* despotism. They were few, and despised. They were wholly occupied with teaching the alphabet and first rudiments of a religion, designed in after ages to become universal, though then hemmed in between Judaism and Pagan idolatry. Heathenism ruled the earth. Pagan emperors, pagan governors, pagan laws, and pagan customs, every where prevailed. What little could be done in social forms, had to be done on the most narrow and restricted scale. This little *was* done, and done *faithfully*,—affording the best evidence, that with greater advantages, such as we enjoy, much more would have been accomplished. What the Apostles would have recommended to their churches had they seen them honored by emperors, kings, governors, and rulers, we cannot precisely say; but we can conceive, that they would never have counselled their Christian *great men* to turn their principles out of doors and throw away their consciences.

We, their Christian successors of the United States, find ourselves professing the same great principles, under very different circumstances. As a Christian people, 61 years ago, we declared our National Independence, averring before the world, that we deemed *all men by nature, equally* entitled to *life, liberty and happiness*, and that governments were instituted to secure these rights, deriving 'their *just* powers from the consent of the governed.' As a Christian people we have chosen our *form* of government, and organized all its departments. It is a government of the people. The people are sovereign. They make their rulers, their laws, and their customs, after their own liking. If they make them right or wrong, they alone are accountable to God and the world. Now just such a nominally Christian people as this, such a nation as this, have said, and they still say, 'we will maintain slavery.' This same nominally Christian people have thousands of religious teachers and pastors, all of their own choosing, to guide them in the paths of duty, and prepare them to render a final account to the Judge of the world. Presidents, governors, judges, legislators, and magistrates of every grade, as well as citizen electors, aid in maintaining these thousands of Christian teachers and pastors. Many of them belong to their churches, and all of them profess to reverence the Christian religion. To these we preach what we deem the great truths of Christianity—'warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus'—watching over the morals of all, as those that must give account to the Common Master in heaven.

Let me humbly ask then, how it is possible for any man to be a good and faithful minister of Jesus Christ under these circumstances, and yet feel that he has nothing to do with the question of slavery? Let me ask, with what sense or reason ministers are told that the abolition of slavery is none of their business—that Christians have nothing to do with it—that it is a mere *political* concern? Are our voters to go to the polls, leaving their consciences at home? Are those whom it is our duty to teach and guide in childhood, youth and age, when they are made legislators, and rulers, thenceforth to turn their backs on the counsels of Jehovah, and be absolved from all religious and moral obligation? Are our presidents, governors, senators, and representatives, being duly elected by a great Christian people to do their public business, entitled to turn round on the ministers and altars of religion and say—‘we are now *political* men; we have done with conscience and morals; we want no more admonitions from prophet or priest; we will manage matters to please ourselves? Is this the process by which men can rise high enough to set at defiance the majesty of God, and to tread down the dictates of that very Christian morality which gave rise to our government and all its offices? And will the sycophantic minions of such men, start up on every hand, and bid the ministers of God hold their peace concerning the sin of slavery and other crying iniquities. O, forsooth, ‘you are a clergyman, and clergymen have no business with *such* questions; they belong to politicians.’ Pray, what is this same thing called *politics*, that has the magic power of turning *right* into *wrong*, and absolv-

ing great men from their original moral obligations? I do not recognise its power to blockade truth and justice. I received my commission from the Great President of the Universe, who has commanded me to preach the truths of the gospel to every creature, to call all sinners to repentance, whether in high or low stations, to reprove iniquity alike in kings and beggars, to teach all men, every where, that they must love each other, and to declare the impending judgments of heaven for those who dare to oppress, hate and wrong their fellow men. This is my commission, and I know no place or station whose incumbent I am at liberty to pass over. If I cannot be a '*clergyman*,' and obey my Master in heaven—why, let me be something else,—let me be a *carpenter*, or a *fisherman*, or a *peasant*—that somehow at least, I may discharge my conscience and go home to God in peace.

For my part, my friends, I am ready to sign a *quit claim* to all the offices, honors, and emoluments of civil government; but I never will relinquish the right vested in me by Jehovah, to bear my testimony to what I deem truth, nor the authority given me by Jesus Christ, to proclaim the *gospel*, with all its warnings, obligations, and sanctions. Whenever I see men, at home or abroad, in private or public life, making rulers at the polls, or sitting in the seats of power, I have one and the same great message of Christianity to them—which I *must* deliver, 'whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear.'

Let me, then, conclude this very protracted discourse with an appeal directly to your consciences. I ask you if you can lie still, and

let the spirit of despotism pursue its prey unchecked? I ask you, if you will allow your influence to *slumber* on this great question of slavery? I ask you, if you can throw it into the scale of oppression? I ask you, if you will not do all in your power, to redeem your dishonored country from its deep and growing infamy? I ask you, if you will not staunch the blood, and relieve the pangs, and pour your kindnesses upon the wounds of your enslaved fellow men, comprising one-sixth part of the inhabitants of this youthful empire? Let me tell you that many a heart is heaving, and many a hand lifting up in this long neglected but holy cause. You will only swell the number of that host, the humblest individual of whom will be proud a few years hence to say, '*I was a despised abolitionist.*' Many have gone up 'to the help of the Lord against the mighty' *before* us; but many more will have to *follow after*. No Christian nation ever before had so grand an opportunity to immortalize itself by great public acts of justice, mercy, and generosity, as ours. It has nearly three millions of degraded, oppressed, and injured people to disenfranchise, to Christianize, to improve and bless. We *can* do all this, if we will—and the work would exalt us to heaven—would fill our mouths with exclamations of applause—would recommend our religion and our republicanism to the ends of the earth. It would take away our reproach from potentates and princes, who now sit and laugh at our boasted liberties, saying, 'Aha, those republicans!' It would be the finishing stroke to the African slave trade—a trade that will live till America more sternly pronounces its doom. It would throw open the

doors to Christian philanthropy, and call forth all the angels of truth and mercy to restore the lost. It would be a reverential invitation for God himself to come down and dwell with man.

But will this opportunity be improved? Will this glorious work of righteousness be accomplished? Will the sublime spectacle, of a whole people, rising up before the universe to renounce their sins and disenthral their slaves, be realized? Will such imperishable renown be won by the present generation of Americans? Will history embalm our memory with such incense? Will our own children, and the children of the now enslaved negroes, rise up in future happier times to bless our memory, and sing together the songs of the free? Or must chains, and stripes, and unrequited toil, and forced pollution, and all the woes of a living death in bondage, go down to our posterity unreformed?

Fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, sons and daughters, Christians and republicans, what will you do? Are you for justice, mercy, liberty, happiness—or are you for injustice, cruelty, oppression and misery? Into which scale will you throw your influence,—that of *right* or *wrong*, that of freedom or tyranny, that of heathenism or Christianity? Look to it, that you grieve not the holy spirit of God, that you stifle not your consciences, that you dethrone not your reason, that you cast not away the pearl of your liberty, that you yield not your own necks to the yoke of the oppressor. Do your duty, with enlightened love to all mankind—do it with uncompromising fidelity to God, to truth, to brother man, and to

your own souls,—and you have nothing to fear. A little while, and your present reproach will turn to glory, the tempest of wrath will have passed away, censure will become applause, opposition be converted to support, and frowns relax into smiles of approbation.

‘ The storms of wintry time will quickly pass,
And one unbounded spring encircle all.’

Therefore, ‘ Brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report—if there be ANY virtue, if their be any *praise*, THINK on these things.’